DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 245 724 JC 840 340

AUTHOR	Brawer, Florence B.
TITLE	Trends in the Humanities in Two-Year Colleges: Final Report.
INSTITUTION	Center for the Study of Community Colleges, Los Angeles, Calif.
SPONS AGENCY	National Endowment for the Humanities (NFAH), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	[84]
GRANT	OP-20046-82
NOTE	159p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC07 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*College Curriculum; *College Faculty; *Community Colleges; Courses; Curriculum Research; *Educational Trends; *Humanities Instruction; National Surveys; Professional Development; Questionnaires; *Teacher Characteristics; *Teaching Methods; Two Year Colleges

ABSTRACT

The result of a 2-year research project conducted by the Center for the Study of Community Colleges, this report summarizes trends in humanities education in the two-year colleges in the United States as revealed through national surveys of full- and part-time humanities instructors, campus facilitators, and community service directors. The first sections of the report describe study methodology and procedures for data analysis. Next, study findings are presented in the areas of: (1) trends in faculty demographics over the years 1975, 1977, and 1983, focusing on age, years at present institution, and racial/ethnic background; (2) trends in humanities offerings during the same years; (3) a comparison of humanities enrollments for the years 1977 and 1983; (4) developments in interdisciplinary studies; (5) student recruitment efforts; (6) support for humanities faculty and programs; (7) support for the development of instructional materials; (8) community service offerings in the humanities; (9) comparisons of the professional activities of humanities faculty in 1975 and 1984; (10) faculty satisfaction levels; (11) course improvement efforts; (12) class activities; (13) comparison of humanities and liberal arts faculty; (14) educational preferences of instructors; and (15) professional, special, and extracurricular activities of faculty. The report concludes with a discussion of the uses of study data. Appendices include survey instruments and responses; letters to participants; and reports prepared during the course of the project. (HB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF COMMUNITY COLLEGES
A NON-PROFIT CORPORATION

ARTHUR M. COHEN
JOHN LOMBARDI
FLORENCE B. BRAWER

1047 GAYLEY AVENUE, SUITE 205
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90024
(213) 208-6088

ED245724

FINAL REPORT

National Endowment for the Humanities
Grant Number - OP-20046-82

Title: TRENDS IN THE HUMANITIES IN TWO-YEAR COLLEGES

Dates: July 1, 1982 - June 30, 1984

Principal Investigator: Arthur M. Cohen

Research Staff: Florence B. Brawer
Jack Friedlander
Michelle Riley

Report prepared by Florence B. Brawer

JC 840 340

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☒ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Arthur Cohen

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

TRENDS IN THE HUMANITIES IN TWO-YEAR COLLEGES

This is the final report for Grant number RE: OP-20046-82, "Trends in the Humanities in Two-Year Colleges."

The project began on July 1, 1982 and continued for 24 months through June 30, 1984. Its objectives were to provide information on the current status of the humanities in community and junior colleges nationwide; update prior studies conducted by the Center for the Study of Community Colleges; compare these Center data with those collected by the Higher Education Panel; provide new information about fiscal support, both internal and external; make recommendations for strengthening the humanities; and disseminate the accrued information to people concerned with the humanities in two-year colleges.

Several steps were taken to fulfill these objectives. Reports were written and recommendations made through publications and/or presentations (see Appendices). The major portion of the project was devoted to data gathering and analysis. These data were derived from surveys administered to three groups of people: full-time and part-time humanities instructors, campus facilitators (usually deans), and community service directors. These groups were large enough to permit cross classification of information by several variables. Sound sampling principles were used to assure representation, and reliability was maximized by obtaining a high rate of completed surveys.

METHODOLOGY

Since the sampling procedure developed in the Center's prior studies proved successful in terms of response rates, representativeness, and efficiency, a similar method to survey the faculty was used in this study. In this procedure a two-stage sample was drawn--a national sample of colleges selected at random within certain strata and a sample of faculty within those institutions. The procedures used in this study are described below.

1. A stratified random sample of colleges was obtained by selecting names of colleges from the 1982-83 Community, Junior and Technical College Directory (AACJC). The 1250 colleges in the Directory are arranged alphabetically by the 50 states. Randomization by type of control was ensured by starting at a random point and taking every fifth private and every fifth public college. A check for representativeness by college size was then made, and colleges added and dropped accordingly. The sample included 172 colleges (14 percent of all two-year colleges). An additional sample was obtained by surveying 403 liberal arts instructors in the 38 colleges comprising the six urban districts with whom we are working through projects funded by the Ford Foundation and the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation. (Costs of obtaining this sample were assumed by those other projects).

2. Letters were sent to the presidents of the colleges inviting participation and requesting the names of contact persons to act as campus facilitators. Other letters were sent to the designated facilitators, asking each of them to send to the Center for the Study of Community Colleges a college catalogue and a Spring 1983 schedule of classes; to forward a survey form to the community services director; and to complete a survey form themselves. The catalogue was needed because the course descriptions isolated courses that properly fell within the purview of humanities courses as defined by the Endowment. The course schedule was

needed so names would be drawn only of the people who were listed as teaching those courses in Spring 1983 and so that the humanities courses could be tabulated.

3. The 1983 class survey revealed a total of 10040 humanities class sections taught by the sample colleges. The project was concerned with drawing a picture of the people teaching these class sections, hence, a random sample of instructors was selected. By drawing every fifth class section, a pool of approximately 200 names of humanities instructors was generated. Duplicates were discarded so that each instructor would respond to questions about a single class section. In addition, surveys were completed by 403 liberal arts faculty members in the subset of 38 colleges referred to in Procedure 1.

4. After pulling the faculty sample for each college, packets were prepared for distribution by the campus facilitator. Each packet included a questionnaire, an envelope stamped "Confidential", and a larger envelope addressed to the facilitator with the faculty member's name on the outside. The facilitator gave a packet to each named instructor who was instructed to complete the questionnaire, then seal it inside the confidential envelope, place it in the envelope addressed to the facilitator, and return it. The facilitator checked the respondent's name against the roster provided by the Center, removed the outer envelope, and returned only the sealed inner confidential envelope. In this way, non-responding faculty were identified but the instructor's anonymity of response was protected because the facilitators would not see the completed questionnaires themselves. After the facilitators retrieved the envelopes they returned them to the Center. If any were still outstanding, the facilitator was then asked to try to retrieve them. Contact

with the facilitators was made by both phone and letter. In all, 2065 surveys were distributed and 1467 were completed and analyzed (a response rate of 66%).

5. A separate short survey form was completed by facilitators in 151 colleges, and by community service directors in 139 colleges. In most colleges the dean of instruction was appointed as facilitator. That person is in a position to respond to questions about fiscal support, including the percentage of discretionary instructional support funds (intramural) and the percentage of grants (extramural) that run to humanities staff and program. The community service directors have ready information on the percentage of their programs that is humanities related.

The surveys used in this project were pilot tested on different faculty groups in six colleges and revised accordingly. Final form of the Instructor Survey was designed to fit into four pages, requiring no more that 20 minutes completion time. The three survey forms with responses from instructors, facilitators, and community service directors are all appended (Appendix A).

Although these procedures demand extreme care and rigor in selecting the samples and pursuing the returns, we feel they are essential in order to make generalizations concerning humanities education in community and junior colleges. The stratification of colleges allows for cross-tabulations among respondents in various types of institutions, while still maintaining an accurate representation of the universe of institutions.

DATA ANALYSES AND RESULTS

Several types of data analyses were conducted, and several papers disseminated describing findings from the three surveys. The remainder of this section presents these findings. Full reports are appended.

FACULTY DEMOGRAPHICS: 1975,1977, and 1983

A comparison of faculty demographics in 1983 with those revealed in 1975 and 1977 suggests that the 1983 cohort of 1967 instructors in 159 colleges is in many ways similar to the 1977 cohort of 860 instructors from 178 colleges and the 1975 cohort of 1493 from 156 colleges (Appendix B). These three cohorts provide answers to such questions as, How does the recent sample of humanities instructors compare to previous samples in terms of age, ethnicity, degrees held, and experience? Have the full-time/part-time ratios changed?

Although the ways in which these three populations were drawn and the differences in survey items account for some discrepancies, answers to many questions in the three surveys were consistent. For example, full-time/part-time ratios appear to be remarkably steady. In 1975 76% of our respondents reported they were full-time; 24% part-time. In 1977 the ratio of full-timers to part-timers was 80:20, and in 1983, 79:22.

A shift has occurred over the 1975-1983 time range, however, in terms of age. In 1975, 49% of the faculty were 40 years or younger while in 1983, the percentage fell to 36%. Conversely, faculty over 40 years represented 51% of the sample in 1975 and eight years later, 65% (see Table 1).

TABLE 1

FACULTY AGE

	1975 (N=1493) Percent	1983 (N=1467) Percent
25 and Under	1	1
26-30	12	3
31-35	20	11
36-40	16	21
41-45	13	19
46-50	14	14
51-55	10	13
56-60	8	8
61 and Older	6	11

The number of years taught at their present institution also reflects this aging. Whereas 48% of the respondents in 1975 had taught 11 or more years, 60% of the 1983 faculty so indicated (Table 2).

TABLE 2

YEARS TAUGHT AT PRESENT INSTITUTION

	1975 (N=1493) Percent	1983 (N=1467) Percent
Less than one year	10	7
1-2 Years	14	6
3-4 Years	17	8
5-10 Years	42	25
11-20 Years	15	48
Over 20 Years	2	6

The faculty appears to be getting older. If retiring faculty had been replaced by new faculty on a one-to-one basis, the age differential would be zero. These data, however, suggest that despite some incentives for early retirement, most faculty are remaining in their institutions and new faculty are not being hired. This aging factor has implications in terms of salaries since instructors with longer periods of service nearly always receive higher pay even though their productivity may be no greater than the younger staff members.

Gender is more consistent. In the two periods for which data were collected (1975 and 1983), males represented 67% and females 33% of the humanities faculty. Affirmative action, however, does seem to have had some effect in terms of ethnicity. Table 3 shows a slight rise in faculty whose background is American Indian/Alaskan, Black/Afro-American, and Hispanic, and concomitantly, a slight decline in White/Caucasian faculty members.

TABLE 3

RACIAL/ETHNIC BACKROUND

	1975 (N=1493) Percent	1983 (N=1479) Percent
American Indian/Alaskan	0.2	1
Black/Afro American	3	4
Chicano	2	2
Other Hispanic	0.3	3
Asian/Pacific Islander/Filipino	1	1
White/Caucasian	91	87
Other	2	2

In previous reports, we predicted a gradual rise in the number of instructors who would hold the doctorate in future years. This proved to be the case, with 16% reporting the doctorate in 1975, 19% in 1977, and 23% in 1983. In 1975, on the other hand, 24% of the faculty reported they were working on the doctorate whereas the 1983 survey indicated only 16%. Faculty who are already in the colleges acquire doctorates and, since there are so few new hires, the ratio of non-doctorate holders goes down. These figures help support the thesis of an older, more entrenched faculty teaching the humanities in community colleges.

COMPARISON OF FACULTY DEMOGRAPHICS, 1983, WITH THOSE FOUND BY HIGHER EDUCATION PANEL, 1979

One objective of this project was to compare our 1983 survey data with findings reported by the Higher Education Panel in its Selected

Characteristics of Full-time Humanities Faculty, June, 1979. (Frank J. Atelsek and Irene L. Gomberg; Number 51, August, 1981).

The methodologies employed in those two studies vary in several ways: 1. The Panel obtained information about faculty by writing to administrators who reported on the faculty while we surveyed faculty individually; our sample represents faculty members responding individually; 2) the Panel surveyed people teaching English and American literature, history, modern languages, and philosophy; we surveyed instructors teaching all humanities subjects; 3) the questions in the two surveys were not the same; and 4) the Panel sample included full-time members only while our sample consisted of 79% full-time and 22% part-time faculty. Despite these differences, some comparisions can be made. Table 4 presents these findings:

TABLE 4

SELECTED DEMOGRAPHICS CHARACTERISTICS OF HIGHER EDUCATION PANEL/AND CSCC 1983 FACULTY SAMPLES.

	HEP Sample Percent	CSCC Sample Percent
Status		
Full-time	100	79
Part-time	-0-	22
Sex		
Male	63	68
Female	37	32
Minority Status	11	13
Highest Degree Held		
Masters	75	73
Doctorate	20	23
	N=12,682	N=1467

CONTEST AREA COURSES: 1975, 1977, 1983

An examination of humanities ares by types of courses presented suggests the shifting pattern within and between academic disciplines.

COMPARISONS BY SUBJECT AREAS, 1975, 1977, 1983

Comparisons of the percent of colleges offering humanities courses by subject area over the three years for which data were gathered reveals a slight upward trend. Courses in history, literature, liberal arts, philosophy, art history/appreciation, and cultural geography were up whereas course in political science, music history/appreciation, social/ethnic studies and religious studies were offered by fewer colleges. Foreign languages and cultural anthropology remained the same in 1983 as they were in 1985. Table 5 presents these percentages.

Table 5

PERCENTAGE OF COMMUNITY COLLEGES OFFERING HUMANITIES COURSES BY SUBJECT AREA

HUMANITIES SUBJECT AREA	Spring 1975 (N=178)	Spring 1977 (N=178)	Spring 1983 (N=173)
HISTORY	90%	92%	93%
State and Local	28	26	31
Western/World	82	83	76
United States	87	88	85
Other World Regions	28	23	26
Special Groups	29	30	26
Social History	25	28	20
POLITICAL SCIENCE	89%	94%	90%
American Government	75	82	71
Local/City/State	40	40	35
Comparative	23	20	28
Tools and Methods	26	26	15
Specialized (Topical)	18	15	32
Jurisprudence	30	34	33
LITERATURE	91%	92%	93%
Intro/Survey	84	87	80
Genre	38	36	35
Authors	20	17	24
Group	24	22	22
Bible	6	6	12
Popular	15	16	11
Classics	10	9	10
FOREIGN LANGUAGES	82%	80%	82%
French	60	56	57
German	40	38	45
Italian	11	12	17
Russian	9	7	4
Spanish	70	68	72
Career-related Spanish	6	10	6
ESL	26	33	27
Classics	4	5	5
Other	8	11	15
LIBERAL ARTS/HUMANITIES	50	51	61
Interdisciplinary/Survey	28	28	38
Theater	24	26	34
Film	12	16	21
Specialized	19	13	16

HUMANITIES SUBJECT AREA	Spring 1975 (N=178)	Spring 1977 (N=178)	Spring 1983 (N=173)
PHILOSOPHY	66%	64%	68%
Intro/History	56	56	54
Ethics	25	23	29
Logic	26	26	39
Religions	21	18	21
Special	15	19	20
ART HISTORY/APPRECIATION	70%	68%	76%
Intro/History-Apprec.	69	67	84
Specialized Culture	3	6	6
Other Specialized Art	7	7	12
MUSIC	74%	70%	69%
Intro/Survey	73	68	75
Jazz	3	6	9
Specialized	7	7	4
CULTURAL ANTHROPOLOGY	44%	46%	44%
Intro/Survey	39	42	41
American Indian	4	5	8
Folklore/Magic/Myth.	1	2	1
Other Specialized	12	11	6
SOCIAL/ETHNIC STUDIES	22%	21%	10%
Ethnic	15	15	6
Women	3	3	4
Individual	1	1	2
Other	12	11	4
RELIGIOUS STUDIES	26%	28%	24%
Intro/Survey	12	14	15
Specialized	10	11	8
Texts	16	17	12
CULTURAL GEOGRAPHY	26%	22%	34%
Intro/Survey	26	21	32
Specialized/Regional	3	1	5

HUMANITIES COURSES ADDED

In 1982, several colleges added at least one course in the various diciplines. These Figures are presented in Table 6.

TABLE 6

HUMANITIES COURSES ADDED BY FIVE OR MORE COLLEGES FROM 1977-1982

Subject	Percent of Colleges That Added a Course
LIBERAL ARTS/HUMANITIES	
Introduction to the humanities	27
Interdisciplinary humanities	
Film history	
Communication studies	
LITERATURE	
Contemporary literature	25
Bible	
Women's literature	
Science fiction	
Special groups (e.g., literature of the American Indian, literature of the old west, writers of the Pacific Northwest, juvenile fiction)	
PHILOSOPHY AND RELIGION	
Ethics	23
Medical-business ethics	
Logic	
Religious studies	
HISTORY	
History of special populations in America (e.g., Women, Blacks, Hispanics, Indians, Jews),	19
State and local history, history of business and labor in the U.S.	
Special topics (e.g., history of architecture, dance, sex attitudes, future society)	
Western civilization	

Continued

Subject	Percent of Colleges That Added a Course
FOREIGN LANGUAGES	13
German	
Spanish	
French	
MUSIC HISTORY/APPRECIATION	11
American music (e.g., jazz, history of popular music in the U.S., Afro-American music, music in American life)	
ART HISTORY/APPRECIATION	11
Art history	
Art appreciation (e.g., art in life, art in America)	
POLITICAL SCIENCE	
Current affairs/world problems	9
Special topics (e.g., women in politics, politics in sports, American legal thought, human rights, uses of power)	
CULTURAL ANTHROPOLOGY	
Special topics in cultural anthropology (e.g., myth, magic, folk religion; medical anthropology, African culture; anthropology and the analysis of communications)	5

COMPARISON OF HUMANITIES CLASS SECTIONS, 1977 AND 1983

In the five years intervening between 1977 and 1983, the number of class sections presented increased in five disciplines and decreased in six. Nearly all of the increase shown in foreign languages (Table 6) was in English as a Second Language.

TABLE 7

COMPARISONS OF TOTAL HUMANITIES CLASS SECTIONS BY SUBJECT AREA FOR SPRING 1977 AND SPRING 1983

Discipline	1977 (178 Colleges) Percent	1983 (173 Colleges) Percent	Percent Change
Anthropology	3.2	2.1	-1.1
Art History/Appreciation	3.8	4.2	+ .4
Foreign Languages	20.5	27.7	+7.2
History	23.0	19.9	-3.1
Humanities (Interdisciplinary)	7.2	7.3	+ .1
Literature	11.4	11.2	- .2
Music	3.3	3.4	+ .1
Philosophy	6.4	6.2	- .2
Political Science	16.6	14.7	-1.9
Religious Studies	1.5	1.4	- .1
Social Studies	3.1	1.9	-1.2

ENROLLMENT COMPARISONS

In the five year time span, 1977 to 1983, two disciplines (foreign languages and philosophy) showed an increase in enrollments, while history showed a two percent decrease; political science, a 2% decrease; and five disciplines showed a slight decrease. One discipline, music history/appreciation, remained the same.

TABLE 8

PERCENTAGE* OF TOTAL HUMANITIES CLASS ENROLLMENTS BY SUBJECT AREA FOR 1977 AND 1983

Discipline	1977* (178 Colleges) Percent	1983* (159 Colleges) Percent	Percent Change
Cultural Anthropology	2.8	2.3	-0.5
Art History/Appreciation	4.6	4.3	-0.3
Foreign Languages	12.3	19.2	+6.9
History	25.5	22.8	-2.7
Liberal Arts/Humanities	10.7	9.8	-0.9
Literature	10.1	9.6	-0.5
Music History/Appreciation	3.5	3.5	0
Philosophy/Religion	8.1	9.0	+0.9
Political Science	19.4	17.4	-2.0
Social Studies/Ethnic/ Cultural Geography	3.1	2.2	-0.9

*Percentages were computed by dividing the total enrollment headcounts per discipline for each set of sampled colleges by total humanities enrollment for each sample.

INTERDISCIPLINARY STUDIES

In Fall, 1983 interdisciplinary courses were offered in 51 percent of the community colleges. Over 60 percent of the interdisciplinary courses included a literature component. History was included in nearly half of the interdisciplinary offerings. Art history/appreciation, music history/ appreciation, and philosophy were incorporated in over 30 percent of the multidiscipline courses.

The average number of subject areas covered in the interdisciplinary courses was as follows:

Two disciplines - 32% of the courses
Three disciplines - 26% of the courses
Four disciplines - 28% of the courses
Five or six disciplines - 14% of the courses

Nearly six in ten of the interdisciplinary courses were team taught. However, faculty members from various disciplines were involved in the planning of 67 percent of these courses.

Which department received credit for an interdisciplinary course when instructors from more than one department were involved? The responses to this question were as follows: both or all departments - 46%; the department organizing the course - 44%; and other (usually some combination of the above) - 10%. Full-hourly credit was awarded to each faculty member involved in team teaching an interdisciplinary course at 51 percent of the colleges while partial hourly credit was granted to each instructor at 36 percent of the institutions. Some other arrangement for awarding hourly credit to faculty members team teaching an interdisciplinary course was employed in 13 percent of the colleges.

Titles of some of the interdisciplinary offerings and the subjects addressed in these courses are listed below.

COURSE TITLE	DISCIPLINES INVOLVED
American Military History	Economics, history, literature, philosophy, political science
Medical Ethics	Philosophy and nursing
Contemporary Humanities	Literature, music, art, philosophy, drama
Contemporary Understandings	Literature, sociology, economics, administration of justice
Business History	History and business
Biological Revolution	Philosophy, psychology
Religion and the Arts	Religion, philosophy, art, music, drama
Greek Achievement	Poetry, drama, art, philosophy
Art Literature and History: Study of the Old Testament	Literature and History
Energy and Society	History, sociology, science
The Indian and American History	History and anthropology
Civilizations of Asia and Africa	History and anthropology
Human Sexuality	Sociology and anthropology
British History	Literature and history
Medieval History	Literature and history
Arts and Civilization	Art, history, composition
Puerto Rican Society and Culture	History, sociology, English composition
Black Biographical Sketches	History, art, English composition

Continued.

COURSE TITLE	DISCIPLINES INVOLVED
Business in Literature	Business and literature
History of Mathematics	History and mathematics
The Human Condition through Literature	Nursing, English literature, history, anthropology
Ways of Knowing	Literature, art, psychology, science
The Art of Being Human	Literature, philosophy, fine arts
The Life Cycle Through Literature	Literature and psychology
Personality in Literature	Literature and psychology
Environment Amid Changing Values	Literature, history, philosophy, natural sciences
Art, Music, and Ideas	Art, music, literature, history
Awakening of Individuality	Literature, philosophy, music psychology
Understanding Cultures	Religion, economics, business, sociology
Religious Themes in Literature	Literature, religion, philosophy

RECRUITMENT EFFORTS

Some instructors are especially vigorous in promoting their courses and in recruiting students. Occupational students, returning older students, and special groups of students (e.g., women, minorities, senior citizens) were actively recruited to humanities courses in over one-half of the community colleges. The percentage of colleges in which humanities faculty made a special effort to attract various groups of non-traditional students into their courses are reported in Table 9.

TABLE 9

PERCENT OF COLLEGES IN WHICH NON-TRADITIONAL STUDENTS WERE RECRUITED TO HUMANITIES COURSES

(151 COLLEGES), 1983

	Recruitment Efforts Percent	Designed Special Courses Percent	No Special Effort Percent
Returning, older students	46	23	46
Special groups (e.g., women, minorities, senior citizens)	39	32	48
Non-degree students	37	19	58
Occupational students	32	34	49
Academically underprepared students	26	33	51

SUPPORT FOR HUMANITIES FACULTY AND PROGRAMS

In the academic year 1982-1983, seven in ten colleges set aside discretionary intramural funds for their humanities staff and programs. About 20 percent of all discretionary intramural funds distributed by colleges were directed to humanities programs to support such activities as instructional development activities, sabbatical leaves, guest speakers, and faculty fellowships.

In the past five years 56 percent of the community colleges received funds from external sources that were earmarked for the humanities. On average, humanities programs received 16 percent of all external grants awarded to the colleges in the sample.

SUPPORT FOR DEVELOPING INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS

Table 10 shows (1) the percentage of colleges in which humanities faculty received support from each of five sources to develop new courses or instructional materials in 1981-82; and (2) the average number of humanities faculty members who received a particular form of support.

TABLE 10

SOURCES OF SUPPORT FOR DEVELOPING NEW COURSES OR NEW INSTRUCTIONAL MEDIA 1981-82

(151 Colleges)

	Percent of Colleges	Average Number Awarded to Humanities Faculty
Sabbatical leaves	29	2.2
Instructional development grants	26	3.3
Funds from outside agencies	19	1.7
Faculty fellowships	10	2.4
Other	8	2.7

USE OF MEDIA

When asked what it would take to make their courses more effective, 43% of the 1977 respondents and 39% of the 1983 respondents indicated that they would like more media or instructional materials. Table 11 presents the types of media used and the increased usage of these materials.

TABLE 11

PERCENTAGE OF COLLEGES IN WHICH THE FREQUENCY OF MEDIA USE IN HUMANITIES COURSES INCREASED FROM 1977-1982

(151 COLLEGES)

	Percent
Audio cassettes, videotapes, records	68
In-class video cassettes or tapes	60
Films/film strips	57
Computer-assisted instruction	38
Audio-tutorials	33
Open-circuit TV courses	26

COMMUNITY SERVICE OFFERINGS

A copy of the Community Services Survey appears in Appendix A. This survey revealed that between 1977 and 1982 the number of arts and humanities activities offered by community service divisions increased at 53 percent of the colleges, decreased at 13 percent of the colleges, and remained the same at the remaining 34 percent of the institutions studied. The average rate of increase in the number of arts and huammities activities offered was 19%; the average decrease in the types of offerings was five percent.

In the academic year 1981-1982, off campus agencies were involved in planning or presenting arts and humanities activities in nearly all community colleges. Members of musical groups, arts councils, libraries, community interest organizations, and local high schools were involved in planning or presenting humanities-related activities in over 40 percent of the colleges. Representatives from local radio or television stations, civic organizations (e.g., Kiwanis, Chamber of Commerce), and senior citizens centers or homes participated in the planning or presentation of off-campus humanities activities in nearly one-third of the colleges.

One in three of the regular humanities faculty were involved in planning or presenting arts or humanities events offered through community service divisions. In 20 percent of the colleges, the faculty in an academic department were charged with approving all academic-related non-credit courses.

Process of approving non-credit courses. In 58% of the colleges, community services divisions have the authority for approving the non-credit courses they offer. The dean of academic affairs (instruction) must approve non-credit offerings in 37 percent of the colleges; a college-wide committee must approve all community services non-credit courses in 13 percent of the institutions.

Funding humanities-related activities. The type and number of humanities-related activities that were offered either on or off campus during the 1981-82 academic year are presented below, along with information on how these activities were funded. On average, humanities-related activities offered through comunity service divisions were supported by a combination of college funds - 63%, participants fees - 24%, and external grants - 13%.

TABLE 12

HUMANITIES-RELATED ACTIVITIES OFFERED EITHER ON-OR-OFF-CAMPUS IN 1981-1982

(139 COLLEGES)

	Colleges Offering Activity Percent	Number of Activities Percent	Percentage of Total Cost Funded by:*		
			Participants Percent	College Funds Percent	External Grants Percent
Concerts, recitals musical events	90.3	11.3	17.8	70.3	10.0
Art exhibits	84.5	5.1	15.4	70.8	8.4
Lectures, seminars	81.5	7.1	15.7	63.7	16.3
Theatrical productions	77.2	3.4	31.1	63.3	5.0
Film series	65.0	3.7	18.2	65.2	15.5
Activities highlighting a particular ethnic group (i.e., Black Culture Week, Asian Culture Week)	58.4	1.3	14.4	75.5	8.6
Tour of local cultural facilities (e.g., architectural or historical sites)	55.6	3.3	41.8	55.0	3.2
Community-based forums on humanities-related issues	45.8	1.4	22.0	42.5	27.4
Historical or period celebrations (e.g., Renaissance Fair, County Centennial)	40.8	.6	25.8	57.8	11.6
Other	26.5	.4			

*Participants fees paid by the people attending the event
College Funds-regularly budgeted and schedule funds
External Grants-special project funds

COMPARISON OF PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES 1975, 1983

Some increases in professional activities appeared over the 1975-1983 time span.

TABLE 13

PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES OF HUMANITIES INSTRUCTORS

	1975 (N=1493) Percent	1983 (N=1467) Percent	Percent Increase
Have you ever			
Received a formal award for outstanding teaching	21	23	2
Taught courses with faculty members outside your department	27	35	8
Had an article published	29	34	5
Attended a conference or symposium related to teaching	76	78	2
Co-authored a book	13	19	6
Applied to an outside agency for a grant	25	25	0
Received grant from own college	4	10	6
Received stipend from private foundation	7	12	5
Received grant from federal/ state agency	6	25	19

The 19% increase in grants from federal and state agencies is notable because it was during this period that NEH increased its awards to community colleges. Since the 1983 survey asked about sources of outside income, we were able to see how much assistance federal and state agencies, in particular the National Endowment for the Humanities, has provided for faculty members in community colleges.

SATISFACTION

One measure of satisfaction was obtained by a survey item eliciting plans for the future.

TABLE 14

FIVE YEARS FROM NOW

HOW ATTRACTIVE WOULD YOU FIND

	Very Attractive		Somewhat Attractive		Unattractive	
	1975 %	1983 %	1975 %	1983 %	1975 %	1983 %
A faculty position at a four-year college or university	42	35	38	38	20	27
A faculty position at another community or junior college	22	17	44	38	34	44
An administrative position in a community or junior college	15	11	26	25	59	64
A position at a school outside the United States	24	18	41	38	35	44
A position in a professional association	6	6	27	29	68	65
Any position but at this college	6	4	21	20	75	77
A non-teaching, non-academic position	3	12	27	33	64	55
I would be doing what I am doing now	41	53	43	35	16	12
I have no idea	8	10	14	12	78	76

Our 1975 and 1983 respondents also see a non-teaching, non-academic position as very attractive (3% in 1975 and 12% in 1983). Satisfaction, compliance, and/or a sense of reality, which allows the faculty to know that they are employed at a time when teaching positions are difficult to find, are indicated by the facts that they remain in teaching and they appear satisfied with their present institution. Also, they eschew faculty positions at four-year colleges or universities and at other community colleges; administrative positions in community colleges; academic positions outside the United States; and "Any position but this college."

ASSISTANCE

Comparisons were made of the availability and utilization of assistance for the faculty. Compared to 1977, faculty members generally have slightly less assistance available to them in terms of clerical and paraprofessional help, test scoring facilities, and media production--perhaps another reflection of the fiscal problems in many community colleges. When such help is available to them, they tend to make slightly less use of it. Only in the case of media production facilities/assistance do somewhat more instructors now utilize this help (1975 - 41%; 1983 - 49%).

TABLE 15

ASSISTANCE AVAILABLE/USED

	Assistance available		Will Utilize this term	
	1977 (N=860) Percent	1983 (N=1467) Percent	1977 (N=860) Percent	1983 (N=1467) Percent
Clerical help	80	71	59	57
Test-scoring facilities	45	43	17	17
Tutors	40	33	21	17
Readers	13	7	5	3
Paraprofessional aides/ instructional assistance	13	7	6	6
Media production facilities/ assistance	68	67	41	49
Library/bibliographical assistance	82	73	54	51

IMPROVING COURSES

When it comes to activities or assistance that instructors see as particularly useful in improving their course, today's respondents do not differ much from the 1977 sample when they were first asked about such help.

TABLE 16

WHAT WOULD IT TAKE TO MAKE THE COURSE BETTER?

	1977 (N=860) Percent	1983 (N=1467) Percent
More freedom to choose materials	10	9
More interaction with colleagues or administrators	21	20
Less interference from colleagues or administrators	5	4
Larger class (more students)	13	14
Smaller class	27	25
More reader/paraprofessional aides	12	13
More clerical assistance	19	17
More media or instructional materials	43	39
Stricter prerequisites for admission to class	22	22
Fewer or no prerequisites for admission to class	1	1
Instructor release time to develop course and/or materials	38	38
Special assistance for underprepared students	N/A	45
Professional development opportunities for instructors	36	39

Despite their limited use of media, "More media or instructional materials" are still seen as most desirable (1977 - 43%; 1983 - 39%), followed by "Instructor release time to develop course and/or materials"(38% for both 1977 and 1983); "Professional development opportunities for instructors" (1977 - 36%, 1983-39%) and "Smaller class" (1977 - 27%; 1983 - 25%).

CLASSROOM ACTIVITIES

What emphasis do instructors give to various classroom activities? Our respondents were asked about a designated activities' strength in determining a student's grade. (see Table 17)

TABLE 17

EMPHASIS GIVEN TO CLASS RELATED ACTIVITIES

	Not included in determining student's grade		Included but counts less than 25% toward grade		Counts 25% or more toward grade	
	1977 (N=860) %	1983 (N=1467) %	1977 (N=860) %	1983 (N=1467) %	1977 (N=860) %	1983 (N=1467) %
Papers written outside class	35	31	37	36	28	33
Papers written in class	69	67	18	21	12	12
Quick score/objective tests	33	34	26	22	41	44
Essay exams	35	31	19	20	47	49
Field reports	84	81	13	15	3	4
Oral recitations	60	58	31	30	10	12
Workbook completion	89	84	9	12	2	4
Regular/Class attendance	46	36	44	53	10	11
Participation in class discussion	31	33	55	55	14	12
Individual discussions with instructor	83	85	15	13	2	2
Other	91	82	4	10	6	8

Looking at activities that count 25% or more in determining the grade, the most recent respondents showed increases over the 1977 sample in terms of papers written outside class (28%; 33%), quick score objective test (41%; 44%), essay exams (47%; 49%), field reports (3%; 4%), oral recitations (10%; 11%). Although most of these increases are slight and caution must be used in interpreting such small increments, taken together it would seem that instructors are becoming more demanding, stricter in their requirements for students in the classes about which they were reporting.

COMPARISON OF HUMANITIES AND LIBERAL ARTS INSTRUCTORS

The two samples responding to the 1983 Instructor Survey were compared on most survey items. The 1467 humanities instructors from 159 colleges and the 403 liberal arts instructors from 38 colleges in six urban college districts--Chicago, Dallas, Los Angeles, Maricopa (Phoenix), Miami-Dade, and St. Louis,--provided interesting information.

Students and Courses. While all courses taught by these two groups of respondents were academic in nature, the average number of students per class varied slightly, with a mean of 26 for the total sample and 29 for the six district sample. In both cases, however, there tended to be 19 full-time students per class. These classes were arrayed as remedial/developmental, introductory/general, and advanced/second level. In the smaller sample (six districts), a few more classes were considered to be advanced or second level (25% as compared to 17% in the larger sample.

When asked about the emphasis given to eleven specific classroom activities in determining students grades, papers written outside class and essay exams weighed more heavily for the humanities sample than for the liberal arts sample. For example, 33% of the humanities instructors reported that papers written outside class counted 25% or more in determining the course grade, as compared with 19% of the six district sample. Essay exams counted 25% or more in determining the course grade for 50% of the humanities sample, compared with 37% of the smaller sample. Conversely, 57% of the smaller group emphasized quick score objective tests as counting over 25% of the grade; the larger group indicated 45%. The larger group of humanities instructors required their students to read 448 pages (mean score) while the liberal arts people indicated a mean of 413 pages.

Taking these responses as a whole, it would seem that the humanities sample tends to expect more writing and reading of their students than does the smaller liberal arts sample. Such an interpretation, however, is clouded by the fact that most of the instructors in the smaller group teach subjects other than the humanities--including mathematics, physics, and chemistry--which do not typically lend themselves to much writing. This point is corroborated by the fact that five percent more of the liberal arts than the humanities instructors emphasized "other", which includes special exams and lab work. Table 18 presents these findings in detail.

TABLE 18

STUDENT ACTIVITIES COUNTING 25% OR MORE TOWARD CLASS GRADE

	Humanities Instructors (N=1467) Percent	Liberal Arts Instructors (N=403) Percent
Papers written outside of class	33	19
Papers written in class	13	16
Quick-score/objective test	45	57
Essay exams	50	37
Field reports	5	4
Oral recitations	13	8
Workbook completion	4	4
Regular class attendance	11	8
Participation in class discussions	12	8
Individual discussions with instructor	2	1
Other (Special Exams, Lab Work)	6	11

Support and Desire One of the more consistent cries of instructors nationwide is the desire for course assistance. Considerable discrepancies exist, however, between the assistance available to them and the assistance they actually utilize.

Table 15 compares responses to this item for the 1977 and 1983 nationwide sample of humanities instructors. Table 19 compares the two cohorts of instructors who responded to the 1983 survey.

TABLE 19

AVAILABILITY OF ASSISTANCE AND ITS UTILIZATION

	Humanities Instructors (N=1467)			Liberal Arts Instructors (N=403)		
	Assistance available Percent	Utilized Percent	Difference Percent	Assistance available Percent	Utilized Percent	Difference Percent
Clerical help	71	57	-14	74	56	-18
Test-scoring facilities	43	17	-26	61	27	-34
Tutors	33	17	-16	45	28	-17
Readers	7	3	- 4	11	4	- 5
Paraprofessional aides/ instructional assistants	9	6	- 3	15	10	- 5
Media production facilities/assistance	67	49	-18	66	45	-19
Library/bibliographical assistance	73	51	-22	70	39	-31

Despite this less-than-enthusiastic use of assistance, when the two cohorts of instructors were asked what they thought would make their course better, over 30% indicated more media or instructional materials; 13% of the total and 21% of the liberal arts respondents noted more reader/paraprofessional aides; and 17% of the total and 21% of the smaller cohort pointed to more clerical assistance. If this help were available, would they use it?

TABLE 20

EDUCATIONAL PREFERENCES

	Humanities Instructors (N=1467) Percent	Liberal Arts Instructors (N=403) Percent
More freedom to choose materials	9	8
More interaction with colleagues or administrators	20	15
Less interference from colleagues or administrators	4	6
Larger class (more students)	14	7
Smaller class	25	32
More reader/paraprofessional aides	13	21
More clerical assistance	17	21
More media or instructional materials	39	31
Stricter prerequisties for admission to class	22	35
Fewer or no prerequisites for admission to class	1	2
Instructor release time to develop course and/or materials	38	36
Special assistance for underprepared students	45	56
Professional development opportunities for instructors	39	31

Demographics. Differences among variables dealing with the respondents themselves are slight, implying that people teaching academic subjects in colleges across the country are quite alike. The following table presents the teaching experience of these two samples.

TABLE 21

TEACHING EXPERIENCE

	High School		At any College		At this College	
	Humanities Instructors (N=715) Percent	Liberal Arts Instructors (N=175) Percent	Humanities Instructors (N=1467) Percent	Liberal Arts Instructors (N=403) Percent	Humanities Instructors (N=1467) Percent	Liberal Arts Instructors (N=403) Percent
Less than one year	9	11	4	2	4	4
1-2 years	22	16	9	8	6	5
3-4 years	21	15	9	9	9	8
5-10 years	31	33	20	20	26	24
11-20 years	13	18	46	44	50	48
Over 20 years	4	7	12	16	6	11

Faculty from the six large urban districts tend to be somewhat older than their humanities counterparts across the country who work in various-sized colleges and different geographic locations. Whereas 72% in the former group are over 40 years old and 35% are over 50 years, 64% of the latter are over 40 and 31% over 50 years.

TABLE 22

AGE OF FACULTY

Age	Humanities Instructors (N=1467) Percent	Liberal Arts Instructors (N=403) Percent
≤ 30	3	3
31-40	32	25
41-50	33	37
51-60	20	11
≥ 61	11	12

Ethnic backgrounds vary little between the two cohorts responding to the 1983 survey. While the current sample of humanities faculty tend to include more ethnic minorities than they had in the 1975 Center for the Study of Community Colleges survey (Table 3)* a slightly greater mix is found among the smaller cohort, the liberal arts instructors--perhaps because they are teaching only in urban institutions.

TABLE 23

ETHNICITY

	Humanities Instructors (N=1418) Percent	Liberal Arts Instructors (N=394) Percent
American Indian/Alaskan	1	0.3
Black/Afro-American	4	6
Chicano	2	2
Other Hispanic	3	4
Asian/Pacific Islander Filipino	1	2
White/Caucasian	87	85
Other	2	1

Gender is also consistent between these two cohorts. Male faculty members represent 68% of the humanities sample and 69% of the liberal arts sample, and females, 32% and 31%.

Degrees held vary slightly, with more doctorates in the liberal arts sample. Data on the highest degree earned for the humanities group reveal 73% masters and 23% doctorates. The liberal arts respondents in the six districts claimed the masters for 71% and the doctorate, for 27%. In previous reports, Cohen and Brawer (1977) predicted a rise in the number of instructors holding the doctorate, and this seems to be borne out. For example, in 1975, 16% of the humanities instructors claimed the doctorate; in 1977, 19%.

*Cohen, Arthur M. and Brawer, Florence B. The Two-Year College Instructor Today. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1977

On the other hand, in 1975, 24% reported working on the doctorate whereas the 1983 survey indicated 18% of the humanities and 16% of the liberal arts instructors so doing. Since many individuals aquire doctorates concomitantly with teaching in the colleges,* and since there are so few new hires now, the ratio of non-doctorates goes down. These figures again help support our thesis of an older, more degreed, and more entrenched faculty teaching the humanities in community colleges today.

Professional Activities How, then, do these faculty members address their work? What are the differences among instructors teaching the humanities exclusively and those who teach other liberal arts courses? The humanities group seems to have been considerably more active professionally in the past three years than the liberal arts group. (see Table 24)

---

*Brawer, Florence B. and Friedlander, Jack. Science and Social Science in the Two-Year College Topical Paper Number 69, July 1979, Center for the Study of Community Colleges and ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges.

TABLE 24

SPECIAL ACTIVITIES

	Humanities Instructors (N=1467) Percent	Liberal Arts Instructors (N=403) Percent
Gone off campus to attend a conference or symposium related to teaching	79	74
Received an instructional development grant from the college	11	10
Received released time to work on curriculum or instruction	13	13
Received in-service credit toward augmented salary	11	11
Received college funds for travel	52	35
Received paid sabbatical leave	10	8

This same sense of involvement pertains to the faculty's affiliation with professional organizations.

TABLE 25

AFFILIATION WITH PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

	Member		Attended Regional or National Meeting		Presented a Paper	
	Humanities Instructors (N=1467) Percent	Liberal Arts Inst. (N=403) Percent	Humanities Instructors (N=1467) Percent	Liberal Arts Inst. (N=403) Percent	Humanities Instructors (N=1467) Percent	Liberal Arts Inst. (N=403) Percent
A state or national faculty organization such as the American Federation of Teachers, National Education Association	58	61	18	19	3	3
A state or national disciplinary association such as American Historical Association, National Council of Teachers of English, American Psychological Association	63	57	43	37	15	11

Using organizational affiliation as a measure, the humanities group appears to be more professionally oriented than the smaller liberal arts sample. They tend more to be members of professional organizations and more to have engaged in developmental activities pertaining to their teaching. In fact, the humanities faculty total 37% more in the activities than the liberal arts faculty, who exceed in only 8% of the designated functions--receiving a formal award for outstanding teaching (22%), publishing an article in a disciplinary journal (1%), receiving a stipend or grant from a state or federal government agency (1%), and teaching a portion of their course to students in an occupational program (3%). This latter finding - teaching to occupational students - is probably accounted for by the fact that the liberal arts group included science instructors who would be responsible for teaching nursing and other science involved students.

TABLE 26

SPECIAL ACTIVITIES

	Humanities Instructors (N=1467) Percent	Liberal Arts Instructors (N=407) Percent
Have you ever:		
Received a formal award for outstanding teaching?	24	26
Authored or co-authored a published book?	20	19
Had an article published in a journal in your field?	35	36
Taught courses jointly with faculty members outside your department?	37	33
Taught a portion of your course to students in an occupational program?	42	45
Developed extracurricular humanities activities (e.g., colloquium, exhibits, concerts)?	66	46
Gone to a local high school to recruit students for your academic program	37	33
Promoted your own classes through presentations or advertisements on campus?	55	51
Applied to an outside agency for a research grant to study a problem in your field?	27	25
Received a stipend or grant from:		
o a private foundation (e.g., Danforth, Ford)?	13	12
o a professional association (e.g., American Historical Association)?	8	7
o a state or federal government agency (e.g., National Endowment of the Humanities)?	27	29

Of those who reported that they had received a grant in the past three years, the humanities sample had 175 (of 1467) instructors who had received a grant from an outside agency (median of $2,502), and 99 who received a grant from their own college (median, $1,000). Of the smaller liberal arts sample of 403 instructors, 22 had received outside grants (median, $4,000) and 26, college grants (median, $913). Thus, 19% of the humanities instructors had received grants whereas 12% of the liberal arts instructors had received them. When the sources of grants were indicated, it was noted that the National Endowment for the Humanities had contributed very heavily--and this, of course, accounts for the larger percent of the humanities sample so being served. On the other hand, we could also argue the point that humanities instructors are more likely to develop proposals than their counterparts in the liberal arts, especially since the National Science Foundation has been so reduced in funding in the past three years.

Along a similar vein, humanities instructors seem more aggressive in augmenting their salaries by activities related to their teaching field. Of the respondents, 79% in the humanities and 78% in the liberal arts samples reported full-time academic status. (see Table 27)

TABLE 27

PERCENTAGE OF INSTRUCTORS AUGMENTING SALARY THROUGH TEACHING RELATED ACTIVITIES

	Humanities Instructors (N=1467) Percent	Liberal Arts Instructors (N=403) Percent
Paid consultant	11	5
Overload or summer school teaching	13	13
Lectures, reading, art work	8	6
Sales of texts or workbooks	8	2
Other (Most, science-related)	16	10

Of the 1983 respondents, 79% in the humanities sample and 78% in the liberal arts sample reported full-time academic status.

Community college instructors responding to the 1975 Humanities Survey were assessed on a construct called satisfaction. Although few of the original items in this scale were included in the 1983 survey, thus making it impossible to reconstruct the scale, the current two groups of respondents seem somewhat more satisfied on specific items. This is despite the popularity of the notion of "burnout." For example, when asked what position they anticipate as attractive five years hence, both groups of respondents preferred doing what they were presently doing.

TABLE 28
ANTICIPATED POSITIONS FIVE YEARS HENCE

	Very Attractive		Somewhat Attractive		Unattractive	
	Humanities Instructors (N=1467) Percent	Liberal Arts Inst. (N=407) Percent	Humanities Instructors (N=1467) Percent	Liberal Arts Inst. (N=407) Percent	Humanities Instructors (N=1467) Percent	Liberal Arts Inst. (N=407) Percent
A faculty position at a four-year college or university	35	24	38	39	28	37
A faculty position at another community or junior college	17	14	38	35	44	51
An administrative position in a community or junior college	11	9	25	18	64	73
A position at a school outside the United States	18	14	38	30	44	57
A position in a professional association	6	4	29	21	65	75
Any position outside current college	4	2	20	13	77	86
A non-teaching, non-academic position	12	9	33	33	55	58
Continuing in present position	53	59	35	32	12	9
No idea	10	4	9	4	30	63

Satisfaction, compliance, and/or a sense of reality that allows the faculty to realize they are employed at a time when teaching positions are at a premium, are indicated by the facts that they remain in teaching and they appear satisfied with their present institution. Also, they eschew faculty positions at four-year colleges or universities, at other community colleges, administrative positions in community colleges, academic positions outside the United States, and "any position but this college."

For those respondents who did see a non-academic position as attractive, the responses vary slightly for the two groups.

TABLE 29

NON-ACADEMIC POSITIONS SEEN AS ATTRACTIVE

	Humanities Instructors (N=753) Percent	Liberal Arts Instructors (N=194) Percent
Business	18	22
Government	16	12
Non-profit	14	10
Self-employed	9	40
Retired/Not in labor force	14	16

IMPLICATIONS AND USE OF DATA

Taken as a whole, the humanities and liberal arts faculties, both of whom might be called the academic faculty, seem to be consistent in many of their responses. Yet, differences do appear in certain areas and these might be considered if some institutions attempt to merge divisions or departments.

The data also provide useful information for education leaders who are considering the effectiveness of services that support instruction. The differences between availability and utilization of support services could hinge on institutional factors that are revisable, such as providing faculty with greater accessibility to media services and paraprofessional aides, shorter turnaround time for clerical assistance and test scoring, a printed review mechanism for media equipment and programs that is updated regularly, and modified policies regarding sabbaticals and travel. Educational decision makers need to consider these services in conjunction with instructors' academically related preferences. The preferences and the services converge at a number of points, but utilization of the services indicates more potential than actual use.

In addition, education leaders developing long-range staffing plans should consider that almost a third of the faculty nationwide is past age 50 in some districts, 20 percent are past age 60. Decisions about replacing these academic positons will have an impact on the budget as well as on instructional and departmental alignments.

Whatever the reasons or directions to take, these data may better help administrators and faculty members to make informed decisions and to understand some of the issues surrounding the role of academic instructors today in community colleges nationwide.

In addition to these data gathering and data interpreting efforts, and to the regular dissemination activities presented in the Appendices other uses are being made of the survey results. A dissertation is currently underway at UCLA, using 1975, 1977, and 1983 Center surveys of instructors teaching the humanities in community colleges nationwide. Maida Hastings is replicating portions of the design used by Roberta Lee in her dissertation, which utilized the 1975 survey results to establish adult developmental patterns. Ms. Hastings is examining these pattersn as they relate to teaching professionalism and involvement in respondents to the 1983 survey.

All in all, the Center for the Study of Community Colleges' efforts in enhancing the humanities seem to have taken root. More colleges are working to increase humanities enrollments, and efforts are still being made to integrate humanities into occupational programs. Whereas the humanities received comparatively little attention in community colleges prior ot 1974, we find that they are now more popular and certainly more visible. We shall continue to disseminate our findings and to discuss recommendations emanating from this and previous projects, as well as to develop other ideas for revitalizing the humanities in two-year colleges nationwide.

PAPERS, REPORTS AND SPEECHES DELIVERED

Date	Presentation/Title	Place or Publication	Number of Attendees
October 15, 1982	CCHA Convention. Speech "Strengthening the Humanities"	Philadelphia	30
October 15, 1982	CCHA Convention. "The Future of the Liberal Arts"	Philadelphia	30
November 12, 1982	CA. Community College Academic Senate Speech "Ways of Strengthening the Liberal Arts in Community Colleges	Los Angeles	40
November 12, 1982	Speech "Future Directions"	Harbor College	107
November 12, 1982	"The Need for A Community College General Education Test"-Speech at Ca. Community Academic Senate	Los Angeles	40
November 12, 1982	CA. Community College. Academic Senate "A Statistical Portrait of the Liberal Arts in Community Colleges"	Los Angeles	40
November 19, 1982	CCHA Meeting."Strengthening the Liberal Arts"	San Francisco	50
November 19, 1982	CCHA Meeting	San Francisco	50
November 19, 1982	CCHA Meeting "Trends in the Liberal Arts	San Francisco	50
December 3, 1982	Workshop: Defining the Curriculum	St. Louis	50
December 3, 1982	Workshop: Defining the Curriculum	St. Louis	50
December 6, 1982	Three presentations on Liberal Arts and the Community Colleges	Kansas City	60,80,60

PAPERS, REPORTS AND SPEECHES DELIVERED

Date	Presentation/Title	Place or Publication	Number of Attendees
March 15, 1983	Trends in Curriculum	ERIC published report	60,80,60
April 26, 1983	Advancing the Liberal Arts "The Genreal Academic Assessment	AACJC, New Orleans	75
April 26, 1983	"Trends in Curriculum 1977-1983"	AACJC Conference, New Orleans	75
June , 1983	Increasing Student Participation in the Liberal Arts	*New Directions*, June 83, No. 42	
June , 1983	Fact Sheet for ERIC Publication "Liberal Arts in Community Colleges Curriculum and Students		
July 7, 1983	LAACD The Group (Round Table)	West Los Angeles College	10
September 20, 1983	Teaching the Liberal Arts	St. Louis Community College	60
September , 1983	Connecting the Liberal Arts within the Community	Community Service Catalyst	
October 21, 1983	Surveying the Faculty, Testing the Students, ASHE	San Francisco	40
November 17, 1983	Surveying the Faculty, CCHA	San Francisco	35
November 17, 1983	Comparing Humanities Instructors	San Francisco	35

APPENDIX A

Instructor Survey
Facilitator Survey
Community Services Survey

Center for the Study of Community Colleges

1 2&3 4 5 6 7 8 9

INSTRUCTOR SURVEY

Your college is participating in a nationwide study conducted by the Center for the Study of Community Colleges under a grant from the National Endowment for the Humanities. The study is concerned with the humanities in two-year colleges—how they are taught by faculty and supported by administrators.

This survey asks questions about one of your classes. The information gathered will help inform groups making policies that affect the liberal arts. All information is treated as confidential and at no time will your answers be singled out. Our concern is with aggregate instructional practices as discerned in a national sample.

We recognize that the survey is time-consuming, and we appreciate your efforts in completing it. Thank you.

1a. Your college's class schedule indicates that in Spring, 1983 you are teaching:

(Course) ______________________ 10-11 (Section) ______________________

If this class was assigned to a different instructor, please allow that person to complete this survey.

If the class is not being taught this term, please give us the reason why, and then return the uncompleted survey form in the accompanying envelope.

b. Class is not being taught because: (explain briefly) ______________________

____

PLEASE ANSWER THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS IN RELATION TO THE SPECIFIED CLASS.

2. a. How many students are enrolled in this class? ______ 12-14

b. Approximately how many students in this class are:

Full time students (12 or more units) ______ 15-16

Enrolled in occupational programs ______ 17-18

Taking the class as a graduation requirement ______ 19-20

Taking the class for their own interest ______ 21-22

3. Which one of the following categories best describes this class? 23

Remedial/Developmental . . . . ☐ 1

Introductory/General . . . . ☐ 2

Advanced/Second Level . . . . ☐ 3

4. Please indicate the emphasis given to each of the following student activities in this class.

	Not included in determining student's grade 1	**Included but counts less than 25% toward grade** 2	**Counts 25% or more toward grade** 3	
Papers written outside of class	☐	☐	☐	24
Papers written in class	☐	☐	☐	25
Quick-score/objective tests	☐	☐	☐	26
Essay exams	☐	☐	☐	27
Field reports	☐	☐	☐	28
Oral recitations	☐	☐	☐	29
Workbook completion	☐	☐	☐	30
Regular class attendance	☐	☐	☐	31
Participation in class discussions	☐	☐	☐	32
Individual discussions with instructor	☐	☐	☐	33
Other *(please specify)*: ______________	☐	☐	☐	34

5. How many pages are students required to read for this class?

In texts and assigned books ______________ (Number) 35-38

Other *(e.g., newspapers, journal articles, handouts)* ______________ (Number) 39-42

6. Which of these types of assistance are available to you this term? Which will you utilize? CHECK AS MANY AS APPLY.

	Assistance is available to me	Will utilize this term
Clerical help	☐ 43	☐ 44
Test-scoring facilities	☐ 45	☐ 46
Tutors	☐ 47	☐ 48
Readers	☐ 49	☐ 50
Paraprofessional aides/instructional assistants	☐ 51	☐ 52
Media production facilities/assistance	☐ 53	☐ 54
Library/bibliographical assistance	☐ 55	☐ 56

7. Although this course may be very effective, what would it take to make it better? CHECK AS MANY AS APPLY.

More freedom to choose materials ☐ 57
More interaction with colleagues or administrators ☐ 58
Less interference from colleagues or administrators ☐ 59
Larger class (more students) ☐ 60
Smaller class ☐ 61
More reader/paraprofessional aides ☐ 62
More clerical assistance ☐ 63
More media or instructional materials ☐ 64
Stricter prerequisites for admission to class ☐ 65
Fewer or no prerequisites for admission to class ☐ 66
Instructor release time to develop course and/or materials ☐ 67
Special assistance for underprepared students ☐ 68
Professional development opportunities for instructors ☐ 69

THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS ARE ABOUT YOU AND YOUR PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES

8. How many years have you taught?

	In high school 70	At any college 71	At this college 72	
Less than one year	☐	☐	☐	1
1-2 years	☐	☐	☐	2
3-4 years	☐	☐	☐	3
5-10 years	☐	☐	☐	4
11-20 years	☐	☐	☐	5
Over 20 years	☐	☐	☐	6

9. At this college, are you considered to be a: 73

Full-time faculty member ☐ 1
Part-time faculty member ☐ 2
Department or division chairperson ☐ 3
Administrator ☐ 4

10. What is the highest degree you presently hold? 74

Associate ☐ 1
Bachelor's ☐ 2
Master's ☐ 3
Doctorate ☐ 4
None ☐ 5

11. Toward what kind of advanced degree are you currently working? 75

Master's ☐ 1
Doctoral degree ☐ 2
None ☐ 3

12. Are you: 76

Male ________ 1
Female ________ 2

13. What is your year of birth? 19________ 77-78

14. What is your racial/ethnic background? 79

American Indian/Alaskan	☐	1	Asian/Pacific Islander/Filipino	☐	5
Black/Afro-American	☐	2	White/Caucasian	☐	6
Chicano	☐	3	Other *(specify)* ____________	☐	7
Other Hispanic	☐	4	____________		

15. In the PAST THREE YEARS, have you:

	Yes[1]	No[2]	
Gone off campus to attend a conference or symposium related to teaching?	☐	☐	80
Received an instructional development grant from the college?	☐	☐	81
Received released time to work on curriculum or instruction?	☐	☐	82
Received in-service credit toward augmented salary?	☐	☐	83
Received college funds for travel?	☐	☐	84
Received a paid sabbatical leave?	☐	☐	85

16. What has been your affiliation with professional organizations in the PAST THREE YEARS? CHECK AS MANY AS APPLY:

	Member	Attended a Regional or National Meeting	Presented a Paper
A state or national *faculty organization* such as the American Federation of Teachers, National Education Association	☐ 86	☐ 87	☐ 88
A state or national *disciplinary association* such as American Historical Association, National Council of Teachers of English, American Psychological Association	☐ 89	☐ 90	☐ 91

17. Have you ever:

	Yes[1]	No[2]	
Received a formal award for outstanding teaching?	☐	☐	92
Authored or co-authored a published book?	☐	☐	93
Had an article published in a journal in your field?	☐	☐	94
Taught courses jointly with faculty members outside your department?	☐	☐	95
Taught a portion of your course to students in an occupational program?	☐	☐	96
Developed extracurricular humanities activities *(e.g., colloquium, exhibits, concerts)*?	☐	☐	97
Gone to a local high school to recruit students for your academic program?	☐	☐	98
Promoted your own classes through presentations or advertisements on campus?	☐	☐	99
Applied to an outside agency for a research grant to study a problem in your field?	☐	☐	100
Received a stipend or grant from: • a private foundation *(e.g., Danforth, Ford)*?	☐	☐	101
• a professional association *(e.g., American Historical Association)*?	☐	☐	102
• a state or federal government agency *(e.g., National Endowment for the Humanities)*?	☐	☐	103

18. If you have received a grant in the past three years please indicate the source and amount of the largest of each:

Outside agency: ______________________ 34 Amount: $ ________ 104_108

Your college: ______________________ Amount: $ ________ 109_113

19. In the PAST YEAR, by what percent was your base college salary augmented by paid activities RELATED TO YOUR TEACHING FIELD, for example:

Paid consultant . . . . ________ % 114_115

Overload or summer school teaching . . . . ________ % 116_117

Lectures, readings, art work . . . . ________ % 118_119

Sales of your texts or workbooks . . . . ________ % 120_121

Other *(specify)* ______________________________________ % 122_123

20. FIVE YEARS FROM NOW (1988) you might be considering the following positions. How attractive do they appear to you at this time?

	Very Attractive¹	Somewhat Attractive²	Un-Attractive³	
A faculty position at a four-year college or university	☐	☐	☐	124
A faculty position at another community or junior college	☐	☐	☐	125
An administrative position in a community or junior college	☐	☐	☐	126
A position at a school outside the U.S.	☐	☐	☐	127
A position in a professional association	☐	☐	☐	128
Any position but this college	☐	☐	☐	129
A non-teaching, non-academic position	☐	☐	☐	130
I would be doing what I am doing now	☐	☐	☐	131
I have no idea	☐	☐	☐	132

21. If a non-academic position appears attractive, what type of position appeals to you most? 133

Business/Corporate . . . . ☐ 1

Government . . . . ☐ 2

Non-profit organization . . . . ☐ 3

Self-employed . . . . ☐ 4

Retired/Not in labor force . . . . ☐ 5

IMPORTANT INSTRUCTIONS

Thank you for completing this survey. Please seal the completed questionnaire in the envelope that is addressed to the project facilitator on your campus and return it to that person. After collecting surveys from all participants, the facilitator will forward the sealed envelope to the Center.

We appreciate your participation in this project.

CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF COMMUNITY COLLEGES
A NON PROFIT CORPORATION

ARTHUR M. COHEN
JOHN LOMBARDI
FLORENCE B. BRAWER

1047 GAYLEY AVENUE, SUITE 205
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90024
(213) 208-6088

October 25, 1982

Dear Colleague:

As we indicated in our recent letter, we need your assistance in gathering information regarding the humanities at your college.

Here are two survey forms. The Facilitator Survey asks about funding and curriculum. The Community Services Survey asks about extra-curricular activities and college/community involvements. We need to have both these forms completed and returned to us within two weeks. You may choose to complete them yourself or you may want to involve people with special program responsibility.

All information is treated as confidential. At no time will answers from any person or any single institution be revealed. Our concern is with aggregate information on curriculum, instruction, and fiscal matters.

For purposes of this project, the humanities are defined as the study of cultural anthropology and geography, foreign languages, history, literature, philosophy, political science, religious studies, and the appreciation and history of the arts, music, and theatre.

We appreciate your assistance, and look forward to working with you. Many thanks.

Cordially,

Florence B. Brawer

Arthur M. Cohen
Principal Investigator

Florence B. Brawer
Research Director

AMC/FBB:jbl

Fall, 1982

FACILITATOR SURVEY

COLLEGE: ______________________ (1-3)

I. WHAT HAS BEEN HAPPENING TO THE HUMANITIES AT YOUR COLLEGE IN THE PAST FIVE YEARS?

1. What courses or programs have been added or dropped?

Added: ____ (4-5)

____

____

Dropped: ____ (6-7)

____

____

2. Have the number of humanities courses or units required for graduation changed?

They have: decreased by two or more courses ______ (8)
decreased by one course ______
remained the same ______
increased by one course ______
increased by two or more courses ______

3. Have special efforts been made to attract any of the following groups of students to humanities courses? (Check all that apply)

	Recruitment Efforts	Especially Designed Courses	No Special Effort	
Occupational students	______	______	______	(9)
Academically underprepared students	______	______	______	(10)
Returning, older students	______	______	______	(11)
Special groups (e.g. women, minorities, senior citizens)	______	______	______	(12)
Non-degree students	______	______	______	(13)

4. Has the frequency of media use in humanities courses changed?

	Increased	Decreased	Stayed the Same	
In-class video cassettes or tapes	_______	_______	_______	(14)
Open-circuit TV courses	_______	_______	_______	(15)
Audio-tutorials	_______	_______	_______	(16)
Films/Film strips	_______	_______	_______	(17)
Audio cassettes, video-tapes, records	_______	_______	_______	(18)
Computer-assisted instruction	_______	_______	_______	(19)

5. Has your college sponsored any conferences, workshops, or special events dealing with some aspect of the humanities?

Yes _______

No _______ (20)

If yes, please specify: ____

____

____

II. NEARLY ALL COLLEGES SET ASIDE FUNDS TO SUPPORT SPECIAL PROGRAMS, COURSE AND MATERIAL DEVELOPMENT, GUEST SPEAKERS, INSTRUCTIONAL MEDIA, AND FACULTY FELLOWSHIPS. APPROXIMATELY WHAT PERCENTAGE OF THESE DISCRETIONARY INTRAMURAL SUPPORT FUNDS WERE GIVEN TO THE HUMANITIES STAFF AND PROGRAMS AT YOUR COLLEGE LAST YEAR?

_________% (21-22)

III. APPROXIMATELY WHAT PERCENTAGE OF THE FUNDS RECEIVED BY YOUR COLLEGE FROM EXTRAMURAL GRANTS OVER THE PAST FIVE YEARS HAS BEEN EARMARKED FOR THE HUMANITIES?

_________% (23-24)

IV. INTERDISCIPLINARY COURSES ARE A WAY OF PRESENTING STUDENTS WITH A VARIETY OF MATERIAL AND CONCEPTS IN AN INTEGRATED FASHION. THEY ARE SOMETIMES CONDUCTED BY ONE INSTRUCTOR WHO COVERS A NUMBER OF SUBJECTS; SOMETIMES BY TWO OR MORE INSTRUCTORS, EACH RESPONSIBLE FOR SPECIFIC AREAS. BUT BY DEFINITION, INTERDISCIPLINARY COURSES CUT ACROSS SEVERAL AREAS, SUCH AS SCIENCE AND HUMANITIES.

1. What interdisciplinary courses are being taught this term and which disciplines are involved?

Course	Disciplines Involved	
(Example: Humanities I)	(Literature, History)	
______________________	______________________	(25-26)
______________________	______________________	
______________________	______________________	
______________________	______________________	
______________________	______________________	
______________________	______________________	

2. In most cases does one instructor assume total course responsibility or are instructors from various disciplines involved?

	One Instructor Involved	Various Instructors Involved	
In planning the course?	_____	_____	(27)
In teaching the course?	_____	_____	(28)

3. When instructors from more than one department are involved, which department receives credit for the course?

Both or all departments ______ (29)

The department organizing the course ______

Other arrangement (please explain) ______________________

____

4. How is instructor load credit apportioned?

Each instructor receives full hourly credit _____ (30)

Each instructor receives partial hourly credit _____

Other arrangements (please explain) ____________________

____

____

V. 1. ADVISORY BOARDS OR COMMITTEES COMPRISED OF LAY CITIZENS OR PRACTITIONERS ARE INVOLVED WITH MOST OCCUPATIONAL PROGRAMS. RECENTLY SOME COMMUNITY COLLEGES HAVE DEVELOPED SUCH GROUPS FOR THEIR HUMANITIES PROGRAM. DOES YOUR COLLEGE HAVE A LAY ADVISORY COMMITTEE TO THE HUMANITIES?

No _____

Yes _____ (31)

2. IF YES, WHAT YEAR WAS IT FORMED?

19_______ (32-33)

VI. HOW CAN AN INSTRUCTOR RECEIVE SUPPORT FOR DEVELOPING NEW COURSES OR NEW INSTRUCTIONAL MEDIA? (Check all that apply).

	Total Number of Awards Last Year	Number Awarded to Humanities Instructors Last Year	
Sabbatical leaves			(34-37)
Faculty fellowships			(38-41)
Instructional development grants			(42-45)
Funds from outside agency(ies)			(46-49)
Other (please specify)			(50-53)

Thank you for completing this form. Please return it to the

Center for the Study of Community Colleges
1047 Gayley Avenue, Suite 205
Los Angeles, CA 90024

CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF COMMUNITY COLLEGES
A NON PROFIT CORPORATION

ARTHUR M. COHEN
JOHN LOMBARDI
FLORENCE B. BRAWER

1047 GAYLEY AVENUE, SUITE 205
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90024
(213) 208-6088

October 25, 1982

Dear Colleague:

Your college is participating in a nationwide study conducted by the Center for the Study of Community Colleges under a grant from the National Endowment for the Humanities. The study is concerned with curriculum, instruction, institutional support, and community involvement in the humanities.

We are asking you for information about the humanities in your college's community service area. All responses to this survey are confidential. Our concern is with aggregate data.

For purposes of this project, the humanities are defined as the study of cultural anthropology and geography, foreign languages, history, literature, philosophy, political science, religious studies, and the appreciation and history of the arts, music, and theatre.

Please complete and return this form within two weeks.

Thanks for your assistance.

Cordially,

Arthur M. Cohen
Principal Investigator

Florence B. Brawer
Florence B. Brawer
Research Director

AMC/FBB:jbl

Enclosure

Fall 1982

COMMUNITY SERVICES SURVEY

College: ______________________ (1-3)

I. PLEASE INDICATE THE NUMBER OF HUMANITIES-RELATED ACTIVITIES THAT WERE OFFERED EITHER ON OR OFF YOUR CAMPUS DURING THE PAST ACADEMIC YEAR. HOW WERE THEY FUNDED?

		Percentage of Total Cost of Event Funded by:*			
	Number of Activities	Participants	College Funds	External Grants	
Art exhibits	______	______%	______%	______%	(4-14)
Concerts, Recitals, Musical Events	______	______%	______%	______%	(15-25)
Lectures, Seminars	______	______%	______%	______%	(26-36)
Theatrical productions	______	______%	______%	______%	(37-47)
Film series	______	______%	______%	______%	(48-58)
Community-based forums on humanities-related issues	______	______%	______%	______%	(59-69)
Historical or period celebration (e.g., Renaissance Fair, County Centennial)	______	______%	______%	______%	(70-77; 4-6)
Tour of local cultural facilities (e.g., architectural or historical sites)	______	______%	______%	______%	(7-17)
Activities highlighting a particular ethnic group (i.e., Black Culture Week, Asian Culture Week)	______	______%	______%	______%	(18-28)
Other (please specify) ______________					(29-30)

*Participants = Fees paid by the people attending the event
College Funds = Regularly budgeted and scheduled funds
External Grants = Special project funds

II. WHAT PERCENT OF ALL COMMUNITY SERVICE ACTIVITIES DID THESE HUMANITIES-RELATED EVENTS CONSTITUTE?

__________% (31-32)

III. WHAT PERCENT OF THE REGULAR HUMANITIES FACULTY ARE TYPICALLY INVOLVED IN PLANNING OR PRESENTING THESE ACTIVITIES?

__________% (33-34)

IV. IN THE PAST ACADEMIC YEAR, WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING OFF-CAMPUS AGENCIES OR ORGANIZATIONS WERE INVOLVED IN PLANNING OR PRESENTING THESE ACTIVITIES? (Check all that apply.)

City, Campus, or County Library	______	(35)
Senior Citizen Centers or Homes	______	(36)
Local Art Council, Art Society, Museum or Gallery	______	(37)
Drama or Theatrical Group	______	(38)
Musical Group (Symphony, Choral Society)	______	(39)
Community Interest Groups (e.g., historical society, literary, travel)	______	(40)
Parks and Recreation Department	______	(41)
Other Community Colleges	______	(42)
Local High Schools	______	(43)
Local University	______	(44)
YWCA/YMCA, Church, Synagogue	______	(45)
Civic Organization (e.g., Kiwanis, Chamber of Commerce)	______	(46)
Local Radio or T.V. Station	______	(47)
Local Bookstores, Record Stores	______	(48)
Other Commercial Groups (e.g., banks, shopping centers)	______	(49)
Auditorium or Large Capacity Facilities	______	(50)
Political Organizations	______	(51)
Other (please specify)______________________________		(52)

V. OVER THE PAST FIVE YEARS, HAS THE NUMBER OF HUMANITIES-RELATED ACTIVITIES IN THE COMMUNITY SERVICE AREA

1. Increased by ________% (53-54)

OR

2. Decreased by ________% (55-56)

OR

3. Stayed the same _____ (57-58)

VI. WHAT IS THE PROCESS OF APPROVAL FOR COMMUNITY SERVICE NON-CREDIT COURSES?

1. All academic-related courses must be approved by faculty in an academic department _______ (59)

2. Community services staff has authority over its offerings _______

3. Each offering must be approved by a college-wide committee _______

4. Dean of academic affairs (instruction) must approve _______

5. Other: ____

____

Thank you for completing this form. Please return it to:

The Center for the Study of Community Colleges
1047 Gayley Avenue, Suite 205
Los Angeles, California 90024

APPENDIX B

Responses to 3 surveys

ATTACHMENT A

CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF COMMUNITY COLLEGES

A NON-PROFIT CORPORATION

ARTHUR M. COHEN
JOHN LOMBARDI
FLORENCE B. BRAWER

1047 GAYLEY AVENUE. SUITE 205
LOS ANGELES. CALIFORNIA 90024
(213) 208-6088

In spring, 1983, the Center for the Study of Community Colleges surveyed a random sample of 1,467 instructors of courses in cultural anthropology, art history, art appreciation, foreign languages (including English as a second language), history, liberal arts, humanities, literature, music history, music appreciation, philosophy, religious studies, political science, social studies, ethnic studies, and cultural geography in 159 community colleges. Following is a summary of the findings.

How many students are enrolled in this class?	N=26

Approximately how many students in this class are:	
Full-time students (12 or more units)	N=19
Enrolled in occupational programs	9
Taking the class as a graduation requirement	20
Taking the class for their own interest	10

Which one of the following categories best describes this class?	
Remedial/Developmental	3%
Introductory/General	80
Advanced/Second Level	17

Please indicate the emphasis given to each of the following student activities in this class.

	Included but counts less than 25% toward grade	Counts 25% or more toward grade
Papers written outside of class	36%	33%
Papers written in class	21	13
Quick-score/objective tests	22	45
Essay exams	20	50
Field reports	15	5
Oral recitations	30	13
Workbook completion	13	4
Regular class attendance	54	11
Participation in class discussions	56	12
Individual discussions with instructor	13	2
Other (please specify) Special Exams Lab Work	10	6

How many pages are students required to read for this class? N=448

Which of these types of assistance are available to you this term? Which will you utilize? CHECK AS MANY AS APPLY.

	Assistance is available to me	Will Utilize this term
Clerical help	71%	57%
Test-scoring facilities	43	17
Tutors	33	17
Readers	7	3
Paraprofessional aides/instructional assistants	9	6
Media production facilities/assistance	67	49
Library/bibliographical assistance	73	51

Although this course may be very effective, what would it take to make it better? CHECK AS MANY AS APPLY.

More freedom to choose materials	9%
More interaction with colleagues or administrators	20
Less interference from colleagues or administrators	4
Larger class (more students)	14
Smaller class	25
More reader/paraprofessional aides	13
More clerical assistance	17
More media or instructional materials	39
Stricter prerequisites for admission to class	22
Fewer or no prerequisites for admission to class	1
Instructor release time to develop course and/or materials	38
Special assistance for underprepared students	45
Professional development opportunities for instructors	39

How many years have you taught?

	In high school	At any college	At this college
Less than one year	9%	4%	4%
1-2 years	22	9	6
3-4 years	21	9	9
5-10 years	31	20	26
11-20 years	13	46	50
Over 20 years	4	12	6

At this college, are you considered to be a:

Full-time faculty member	79%
Part-time faculty member	22%

What is the highest degree you presently hold?

Master's	73%
Doctorate	23%

Toward what kind of advanced degree are you currently working?

Doctoral degree	18%

Are you:

Male	68%
Female	32%

How old are you?

30	3%
31-40	32%
41-50	33%
51-60	20%
61	11%

What is your racial/ethnic background?

American Indian/Alaskan	1%	Asian/Pacific Islander/Filipino	1%
Black/Afro-American	4%	White/Caucasian	87%
Chicano	2%	Other (specify)	2%
Other Hispanic	3%		

In the PAST THREE YEARS, have you:

	Yes
Gone off campus to attend a conference or symposium related to teaching?	79%
Received an instructional development grant from the college?	11%
Received released time to work on curriculum or instruction?	13%
Received in-service credit toward augmented salary?	11%
Received college funds for travel?	52%
Received a paid sabbatical leave?	10%

What has been your affiliation with professional organizations in the PAST THREE YEARS?

	Member	Attended a Regional or National Meeting	Presented a Paper
A state or national faculty organization such as the American Federation of Teachers, National Education Association	58%	18%	3%
A state or national disciplinary association such as American Historical Association, National Council of Teachers of English, American Psychological Association	63%	43%	15%

Have you ever:

	Yes
Received a formal award for outstanding teaching?	24%
Authored or co-authored a published book?	20%
Had an article published in a journal in your field?	35%
Taught courses jointly with faculty members outside your department?	37%
Taught a portion of your course to students in an occupational program	42%
Developed extracurricular humanities activities (e.g., colloquium, exhibits, concerts)?	66%
Gone to a local high school to recruit students for your academic program?	37%
Promoted your own classes through presentations or advertisements on campus?	55%
Applied to an outside agency for a research grant to study a problem in your field?	27%
Received a stipend or grant from: • a private foundation (e.g., Danforth, Ford)?	13%
• a professional association (e.g., American Historical Association)?	8%
• a state or federal government agency (e.g., National Endowment for the Humanities)?	27%

If you have received a grant in the past three years please indicate the source and amount of the largest of each:

Outside agency:	N=175	Med=$2,502
Your college:	99	$1,000

In the PAST YEAR, by what percent was your base college salary augmented by paid activities RELATED TO YOUR TEACHING FIELD, for example:

Paid consultant	N=123	11%
Overload or summer school teaching	644	13%
Lectures, readings, art work	92	8%
Sales of your texts or workbooks	46	8%
Other (specify) (Most business-related)	106	16%

FIVE YEARS FROM NOW (1988) you might be considering the following positions. How attractive do they appear to you at this time?

	Very Attractive	Somewhat Attractive	Un-Attractive
A faculty position at a four-year college or university	35%	38%	28%
A faculty position at another community or junior college	17%	38%	44%
An administrative position in a community or junior college	11%	25%	64%
A position at a school outside the U.S.	18%	38%	44%
A position in a professional association	6%	29%	65%
Any position but this college	4%	20%	77%
A non-teaching, non-academic position	12%	33%	55%
I would be doing what I am doing now	53%	35%	12%

If a non-academic position appears attractive, what type of position appeals to you most?

Business/Corporate	18%	Self-employed	38%
Government	16%	Retired/Not in labor force	14%
Non-profit organization	14%		

CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF COMMUNITY COLLEGES
A NON PROFIT CORPORATION

ARTHUR M. COHEN
JOHN LOMBARDI
FLORENCE B. BRAWER

1047 GAYLEY AVENUE, SUITE 205
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90024
(213) 208-6088

TRENDS IN COMMUNITY COLLEGE HUMANITIES EDUCATION 1977-1982

Results of Fall 1982 Survey

In fall 1982 the Center for the Study of Community Colleges conducted a survey of humanities education in the nation's community and junior colleges. An objective of this survey was to identify changes that had occurred in humanities programs during the past five years. The study was sponsored by the National Endowment for the Humanities.

Information in this study was obtained from a Facilitator Survey and a Community Services Survey that were sent to a random national sample of 172 community and junior colleges. The Facilitator Survey was completed in 151 colleges and the Community Services Survey was completed in 139 colleges. The findings from these surveys are reported in the following four sections of this report.

1. Humanities Courses Added to the Curriculum from 1977-1982.
2. Interdisciplinary Courses Offered in Fall 1982.
3. Support for Humanities Faculty and Programs.
4. Humanities in Community Services Divisions.

Humanities Courses Added to the Curriculum From 1977-1982

In the past five years the number of humanities courses required for graduation was increased in 16 percent of the colleges and decreased in only 3 percent of the colleges. The number of humanities courses required for graduation did not change in the remaining 81 percent of the institutions studied.

Seven in ten colleges added one or more new humanities courses to their programs. The number of colleges adding a new humanities course exceeded the number that dropped a humanities course from their program by a rate of more than two to one. In general, the types of humanities courses added to the curriculum focused on a specific topic (e.g., women in politics, medieval ethics, history of labor in the U.S., literature of the Irish, music in American life). New humanities courses added at five or more colleges in the past five years are listed below.

N=151 Fall, 1982

FACILITATOR SURVEY

COLLEGE: ______________________ (1-3)

I. WHAT HAS BEEN HAPPENING TO THE HUMANITIES AT YOUR COLLEGE IN THE PAST FIVE YEARS?

1. What courses or programs have been added or dropped?

Added: NO COURSES=30.5% 3 COURSES=11.3% (4-5)
1 COURSE= 21.9% 4 OR MORE COURSES =29%
2COURSES=7.3 %

Dropped: NO COURSES= 63.6% (6-7)
1 COURSE =13.9% 3 OR MORE COURSES = 6.6%
2 OR COURSES.6.0% 4 OR MORE COURSES= 9.1%

2. Have the number of humanities courses or units required for graduation changed?

They have: decreased by two or more courses 2.0% (8)
N=148 decreased by one course 1.4%
remained the same 81.1%
increased by one course 10.8%
increased by two or more courses 4.7%

3. Have special efforts been made to attract any of the following groups of students to humanities courses? (Check all that apply)

		RECRUIT & SPECIAL COURSES	Recruitment Efforts	Especially Designed Courses	No Special Effort	
N=146	Occupational students	15.1%	17.1	11.2	48.5	(9)
N=146	Academically underprepared students	11.0	15.0	22.6	51.4	(10)
N=147	Returning, older students	14.3	32.0	8.2	48.6	(11)
N=147	Special groups (e.g. women, minorities senior citizens)	18.4	29.4	18.5	47.6	(12)
N=143	Non-degree students	10.5	23.1	8.4	51.6	(13)

4. Has the frequency of media use in humanities courses changed?

		Increased	Decreased	Stayed the Same	
N=149	In-class video cassettes or tapes	59.7	1.3	38.9	(14)
N=133	Open-circuit TV courses	25.6	5.3	69.2	(15)
N=134	Audio-tutorials	32.8	2.2	64.9	(16)
N=150	Films/Film strips	56.7	4.0	36.8	(17)
N=148	Audio cassettes, video-tapes, records	67.6	-0-	32.4	(18)
N=130	Computer-assisted instruction	37.7	1.5	60.8	(19)

5. Has your college sponsored any conferences, workshops, or special events dealing with some aspect of the humanities?

N=149

Yes 72.5

No 27.5

(20)

If yes, please specify: ____________________

II. NEARLY ALL COLLEGES SET ASIDE FUNDS TO SUPPORT SPECIAL PROGRAMS, COURSE AND MATERIAL DEVELOPMENT, GUEST SPEAKERS, INSTRUCTIONAL MEDIA, AND FACULTY FELLOWSHIPS. APPROXIMATELY WHAT PERCENTAGE OF THESE DISCRETIONARY INTRAMURAL SUPPORT FUNDS WERE GIVEN TO THE HUMANITIES STAFF AND PROGRAMS AT YOUR COLLEGE LAST YEAR?

N=119 ________%

(21-22)

	% of Colleges
0	30.3
1-10%	32.8
11-24%	15.1
25% or more	21.8

III. APPROXIMATELY WHAT PERCENTAGE OF THE FUNDS RECEIVED BY YOUR COLLEGE FROM EXTRAMURAL GRANTS OVER THE PAST FIVE YEARS HAS BEEN EARMARKED FOR THE HUMANITIES?

N=120 ________%

(23-24)

	% of Colleges
0	42.5
1-10%	38.3
11-24%	6.7
25% or more	12.5

IV. INTERDISCIPLINARY COURSES ARE A WAY OF PRESENTING STUDENTS WITH A VARIETY OF MATERIAL AND CONCEPTS IN AN INTEGRATED FASHION. THEY ARE SOMETIMES CONDUCTED BY ONE INSTRUCTOR WHO COVERS A NUMBER OF SUBJECTS; SOMETIMES BY TWO OR MORE INSTRUCTORS, EACH RESPONSIBLE FOR SPECIFIC AREAS. BUT BY DEFINITION, INTERDISCIPLINARY COURSES CUT ACROSS SEVERAL AREAS, SUCH AS SCIENCE AND HUMANITIES.

1. What interdisciplinary courses are being taught this term and which disciplines are involved?

	Course	Disciplines Involved	
	(Example: Humanities I)	(Literature, History)	
		N=75	(25-26)
N=151	NO COURSES= 49%	TWO DISCIPLINES= 28%	
	1 COURSE =23.8	THREE DISCIPLINES=29.3%	
	2 OR More COURSES =27.2	FOUR DISCIPLINES = 26.7%	
		FIVE OR MORE = 16.0	

2. In most cases does one instructor assume total course responsibility or are instructors from various disciplines involved?

		One Instructor Involved	Various Instructors Involved	COMBINATION OF MATERIALS	
N=84	In planning the course?	33.3	63.1	3.6	(27)
N=84	In teaching the course?	41.7	54.8	3.6	(28)

3. When instructors from more than one department are involved, which department receives credit for the course?

N=72	Both or all departments	45.8	(29
	The department organizing the course	44.5	
	Other arrangement (please explain)	9.7	

4. How is instructor load credit apportioned?

	Each instructor receives full hourly credit	51.4	(30)
N=72	Each instructor receives partial hourly credit	36.1	
	Other arrangements (please explain)	12.5	

V. 1. ADVISORY BOARDS OR COMMITTEES COMPRISED OF LAY CITIZENS OR PRACTITIONERS ARE INVOLVED WITH MOST OCCUPATIONAL PROGRAMS. RECENTLY SOME COMMUNITY COLLEGES HAVE DEVELOPED SUCH GROUPS FOR THEIR HUMANITIES PROGRAM. DOES YOUR COLLEGE HAVE A LAY ADVISORY COMMITTEE TO THE HUMANITIES?

N=130	No	82.7	(31)
	Yes	17.3 (26 colleges)	

2. IF YES, WHAT YEAR WAS IT FORMED?

19 50% formed between 1980 & 1983 (32-33)

50% formed between 1970 & 1979

VI. HOW CAN AN INSTRUCTOR RECEIVE SUPPORT FOR DEVELOPING NEW COURSES OR NEW INSTRUCTIONAL MEDIA? (Check all that apply).

		Total Number of Awards Last Year		Number Awarded to Humanities Instructors Last Year	
Sabbatical leaves	(N=110)	48.2	(N=112)	33.9%	(34-37)
Faculty fellowships	(N=89)	12.4	(N=92)	14.1	(38-41)
Instructional development grants	(N=101)	39.6	(N=108)	20.4	(42-45)
Funds from outside agency(ies)	(N=88)	31.8	(N=92)	25.8	(46-49)
Other (please specify)	(N=77)	15.6	(N=80)	12.5	(50-53)

Thank you for completing this form. Please return it to the

Center for the Study of Community Colleges
1047 Gayley Avenue, Suite 205
Los Angeles, CA 90024

CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF COMMUNITY COLLEGES
A NON-PROFIT CORPORATION

ARTHUR M. COHEN
JOHN LOMBARDI
FLORENCE B. BRAWER

1047 GAYLEY AVENUE, SUITE 205
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90024
(213) 206-6088

In spring, 1983, the Center for the Study of Community Colleges surveyed a random sample of 403 instructors of courses in the humanities, sciences, and social sciences in six, large, urban community college districts: Chicago, Dallas, Los Angeles, Miami, Phoenix, and St. Louis. Following is a summary of the findings.

Total Respondents N=403

How many students are enrolled in this class? N=29

Approximately how many students in this class are:

		(Respondents)
Full-time students (12 or more units)	N=19	(313)
Enrolled in occupational programs	12	(1[illegible]8)
Taking the class as a graduation requirement	21	(267)
Taking the class for their own interest	10	(233)

Which one of the following categories best describes this class?

Remedial/Developmental	6%
Introductory/General	69%
Advanced/Second Level	25%

Please indicate the emphasis given to each of the following student activities in this class.

	Included but counts less than 25% toward grade	Counts 25% or more toward grade
Papers written outside of class	40%	19%
Papers written in class	16%	16%
Quick-score/objective tests	14%	57%
Essay exams	19%	37%
Field reports	16%	4%
Oral recitations	23%	8%
Workbook completion	19%	4%
Regular class attendance	43%	8%
Participation in class discussions	43%	8%
Individual discussions with instructor	13%	1%
Other (please specify)	12%	11%

How many pages are students required to read for this class? N=413

Which of these types of assistance are available to you this term? Which will you utilize? CHECK AS MANY AS APPLY.

	Assistance is available to me	Will Utilize this term
Clerical help	74%	56%
Test-scoring facilities	61%	27%
Tutors	45%	28%
Readers	11%	4%
Paraprofessional aides/instructional assistants	15%	10%
Media production facilities/assistance	66%	45%
Library/bibliographical assistance	70%	39%

Although this course may be very effective, what would it take to make it better? CHECK AS MANY AS APPLY.

More freedom to choose materials	8%
More interaction with colleagues or administrators	15%
Less interference from colleagues or administrators	6%
Larger class (more students)	7%
Smaller class	32%
More reader/paraprofessional aides	21%
More clerical assistance	21%
More media or instructional materials	31%
Stricter prerequisites for admission to class	35%
Fewer or no prerequisites for admission to class	2%
Instructor release time to develop course and/or materials	36%
Special assistance for underprepared students	56%
Professional development opportunities for instructors	31%

How many years have you taught?

	In high school	At any college	At this college
Less than one year	11%	2%	4%
1-2 years	16%	8%	5%
3-4 years	15%	9%	8%
5-10 years	33%	20%	24%
11-20 years	18%	44%	48%
Over 20 years	7%	16%	11%

At this college, are you considered to be a:

Full-time faculty member	78%
Part-time faculty member	17%

What is the highest degree you presently hold?

Master's	71%
Doctorate	27%

Toward what kind of advanced degree are you currently working?

Doctoral degree	16%

Are you:

Male	69%
Female	31%

How old are you?

≤ 30	3%
31-40	25%
41-50	37%
51-60	23%
≥ 61	12%

What is your racial/ethnic background?

American Indian/Alaskan	.3%	Asian/Pacific Islander/Filipino	2%
Black/Afro-American	6%	White/Caucasian	85%
Chicano	2%	Other (specify)	1%
Other Hispanic	4%		

In the PAST THREE YEARS, have you:

	Yes
Gone off campus to attend a conference or symposium related to teaching?	74%
Received an instructional development grant from the college?	10%
Received released time to work on curriculum or instruction?	13%
Received in-service credit toward augmented salary?	11%
Received college funds for travel?	35%
Received a paid sabbatical leave?	8%

What has been your affiliation with professional organizations in the PAST THREE YEARS?

	Member	Attended a Regional or National Meeting	Presented a Paper
A state or national *faculty organization* such as the American Federation of Teachers, National Education Association	61%	19%	3%
A state or national *disciplinary association* such as American Historical Association, National Council of Teachers of English, American Psychological Association	57%	37%	11%

Have you ever:

	Yes
Received a formal award for outstanding teaching?	26%
Authored or co-authored a published book?	19%
Had an article published in a journal in your field?	36%
Taught courses jointly with faculty members outside your department?	33%
Taught a portion of your course to students in an occupational program	45%
Developed extracurricular humanities activities (e.g., colloquium, exhibits, concerts)?	46%
Gone to a local high school to recruit students for your academic program?	33%
Promoted your own classes through presentations or advertisements on campus?	51%
Applied to an outside agency for a research grant to study a problem in your field?	25%
Received a stipend or grant from:	
• a private foundation (e.g., Danforth, Ford)?	12%
• a professional association (e.g., American Historical Association)?	7%
• a state or federal government agency (e.g., National Endowment for the Humanities)?	29%

If you have received a grant in the past three years please indicate the source and amount of the largest of each:

Outside agency:	N=22	Med.= $4,600
Your college:	26	$913

In the PAST YEAR, by what percent was your base college salary augmented by paid activities RELATED TO YOUR TEACHING FIELD, for example:

Paid consultant	N=33	5%
Overload or summer school teaching	205	13%
Lectures, readings, art work	14	6%
Sales of your texts or workbooks	13	2%
Other (specify)	33	10%

FIVE YEARS FROM NOW (1988) you might be considering the following positions. How attractive do they appear to you at this time?

	Very Attractive	Somewhat Attractive	Un-Attractive
A faculty position at a four-year college or university	24%	39%	37%
A faculty position at another community or junior college	14%	35%	51%
An administrative position in a community or junior college	9%	18%	73%
A position at a school outside the U.S.	14%	30%	57%
A position in a professional association	4%	21%	75%
Any position but this college	2%	13%	86%
A non-teaching, non-academic position	9%	33%	58%
I would be doing what I am doing now	59%	32%	9%

If a non-academic position appears attractive, what type of position appeals to you most?

Business/Corporate	22%	Self-employed	40%
Government	12%	Retired/Not in labor force	16%
Non-profit organization	10%		

N= 139

Fall 1982

COMMUNITY SERVICES SURVEY

College: ____________________ (1-3)

I. PLEASE INDICATE THE NUMBER OF HUMANITIES-RELATED ACTIVITIES THAT WERE OFFERED EITHER ON OR OFF YOUR CAMPUS DURING THE PAST ACADEMIC YEAR. HOW WERE THEY FUNDED?

			Percentage of Total Cost of Event Funded by:*			
	% of Colleges Offering	Number of Activities	Participants	College Funds	External Grants	
Art exhibits	84.5	5.1	15.4 %	70.8 %	8.4 %	(4-14)
Concerts, Recitals, Musical Events	90.3	11.3	17.8 %	70.3 %	10.0 %	(15-25)
Lectures, Seminars	81.5	7.1	15.7 %	63.7 %	16.3 %	(26-36)
Theatrical productions	77.2	3.4	31.1 %	63.3 %	5.0 %	(37-47)
Film series	65.0	3.7	18.2 %	65.2 %	15.5 %	(48-58)
Community-based forums on humanities-related issues	45.8	1.4	22.0 %	42.5 %	27.4 %	(59-69)
Historical or period celebration (e.g., Renaissance Fair, County Centennial)	40.8	0.6	25.8 %	57.8 %	11.6 %	(70-77; 4-6)
Tour of local cultural facilities (e.g., architectural or historical sites)	55.6	3.3	41.8 %	55.0 %	3.2 %	(7-17)
Activities highlighting a particular ethnic group (i.e., Black Culture Week, Asian Culture Week)	58.4	1.3	14.4 %	75.5 %	8.6 %	(18-28)
Other (please specify)	26.5	.4				(29-30)

---

*Participants = Fees paid by the people attending the event
College Funds = Regularly budgeted and scheduled funds
External Grants = Special project funds

II. WHAT PERCENT OF ALL COMMUNITY SERVICE ACTIVITIES DID THESE HUMANITIES-RELATED EVENTS CONSTITUTE?

33.7 % (31-32)

III. WHAT PERCENT OF THE REGULAR HUMANITIES FACULTY ARE TYPICALLY INVOLVED IN PLANNING OR PRESENTING THESE ACTIVITIES?

33.4 % (33-34)

IV. IN THE PAST ACADEMIC YEAR, WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING OFF-CAMPUS AGENCIES OR ORGANIZATIONS WERE INVOLVED IN PLANNING OR PRESENTING THESE ACTIVITIES? (Check all that apply.)

City, Campus, or County Library	48.1%	(35)
Senior Citizen Centers or Homes	31.6%	(36)
Local Art Council, Art Society, Museum or Gallery	56.4%	(37)
Drama or Theatrical Group	46.6%	(38)
Musical Group (Symphony, Choral Society)	60.9%	(39)
Community Interest Groups (e.g., historical society, literary, travel)	47.4%	(40)
Parks and Recreation Department	18.8%	(41)
Other Community Colleges	21.1%	(42)
Local High Schools	41.4%	(43)
Local University	16.5%	(44)
YWCA/YMCA, Church, Synagogue	24.1%	(45)
Civic Organization (e.g., Kiwanis, Chamber of Commerce)	32.3%	(46)
Local Radio or T.V. Station	33.1%	(47)
Local Bookstores, Record Stores	9.0%	(48)
Other Commercial Groups (e.g., banks, shopping centers)	22.6%	(49)
Auditorium or Large Capacity Facilities	21.1%	(50)
Political Organizations	19.5%	(51)
Other (please specify)	7.6%	(52)

V. OVER THE PAST FIVE YEARS, HAS THE NUMBER OF HUMANITIES-RELATED ACTIVITIES IN THE COMMUNITY SERVICE AREA

1. Increased by 18.7 % 53% of the colleges (53-54)

OR

2. Decreased by 5.3 % 12.8% of the colleges (55-56)

OR

3. Stayed the same ___ 34.6% of the colleges (57-58)

VI. WHAT IS THE PROCESS OF APPROVAL FOR COMMUNITY SERVICE NON-CREDIT COURSES?

1. All academic-related courses must be approved by faculty in an academic department 20.9% (59)
2. Community services staff has authority over its offerings 58.2%
3. Each offering must be approved by a college-wide committee 13.4%
4. Dean of academic affairs (instruction) must approve 36.6%
5. Other: ______ 14.9%

Thank you for completing this form. Please return it to:

The Center for the Study of Community Colleges
1047 Gayley Avenue, Suite 205
Los Angeles, California 90024

COLLEGE CONTROL	
Public	88.5%
Private	11.5%

COLLEGE SIZE	
Small	34.5%
Medium	45.3%
Large	20.1%

APPENDIX C

Letters to personnel in participating Colleges

CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF COMMUNITY COLLEGES
A NON PROFIT CORPORATION

ARTHUR M. COHEN
JOHN LOMBARDI
FLORENCE B. BRAWER

1047 GAYLEY AVENUE, SUITE 205
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90024
(213) 208-6088

Dear Colleague:

Your president has appointed you as liaison between your college and our Center on a project assessing the humanities in two-year colleges. Sponsored by the National Endowment for the Humanities, this phase of the study will update our 1975 and 1977 studies of faculty, curriculum, and instructional practices in selected colleges throughout the nation. As the on-campus facilitator, you are asked to respond to a survey form dealing with questions about enrollments, extra-curricular offerings, and changes occurring in the humanities. You will also be asked to distribute and retrieve another survey form for selected instructors.

We shall be sending your questionnaire shortly, as well as a questionnaire concerned with community services. The surveys addressed to the instructors will be along in the spring.

We very much appreciate your college's participation and your personal help in this important project.

Cordially,

A. Cohen
Arthur M. Cohen
Principal Investigator

Florence B. Brawer
Florence B. Brawer
Research Director

CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF COMMUNITY COLLEGES
A NON PROFIT CORPORATION

ARTHUR M. COHEN
JOHN LOMBARDI
FLORENCE B. BRAWER

1047 GAYLEY AVENUE, SUITE 205
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90024
(213) 208-6088

September 10, 1982

Under a grant from the National Endowment for the Humanities we are updating the studies of faculty, curriculum, and instruction in the humanities in two-year colleges that we conducted in 1975 and 1977. We are inviting your college to participate.

In this phase of the study we are surveying a sample of part-time as well as full-time faculty. Your college's participation involves having these instructors, whom we will select at random, complete a survey form which will take about 15 minutes. This questionnaire asks about their teaching practices, professional involvements, and the types of instructional support they receive. All responses will be held in strictest confidence. Names of participating colleges and respondents will not be revealed.

We need the name of a facilitator at your campus who can distribute and retrieve the survey forms in spring 1983 and who can provide general information about the humanities at your college. After you have returned the enclosed letter with that person's name, we will correspond with him or her.

Our earlier surveys yielded exceptionally high response rates and the resulting analyses were well received. Publications detailing the findings were sent to all participating colleges and distributed also through the ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges. The findings have been found useful for considering policies affecting the humanities from the local campus to the national level. We hope you will participate in this important project.

Thanks very much.

Cordially,

Arthur M. Cohen
Principal Investigator

AMC:cp
Enclosure

CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF COMMUNITY COLLEGES
A NON PROFIT CORPORATION

ARTHUR M. COHEN
JOHN LOMBARDI
FLORENCE B. BRAWER

1047 GAYLEY AVENUE, SUITE 205
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90024
(213) 206-8086

October 25, 1982

Dear Colleague:

As we indicated in our recent letter, we need your assistance in gathering information regarding the humanities at your college.

Here are two survey forms. The Facilitator Survey asks about funding and curriculum. The Community Services Survey asks about extra-curricular activities and college/community involvements. We need to have both these forms completed and returned to us within two weeks. You may choose to complete them yourself or you may want to involve people with special program responsibility.

All information is treated as confidential. At no time will answers from any person or any single institution be revealed. Our concern is with aggregate information on curriculum, instruction, and fiscal matters.

For purposes of this project, the humanities are defined as the study of cultural anthropology and geography, foreign languages, history, literature, philosophy, political science, religious studies, and the appreciation and history of the arts, music, and theatre.

We appreciate your assistance, and look forward to working with you. Many thanks.

Cordially,

Florence B. Brawer

Arthur M. Cohen
Principal Investigator

Florence B. Brawer
Research Director

AMC/FBB:jbl

Fall, 1982

FACILITATOR SURVEY

COLLEGE: ______________________ (1-3)

I. WHAT HAS BEEN HAPPENING TO THE HUMANITIES AT YOUR COLLEGE IN THE PAST FIVE YEARS?

1. What courses or programs have been added or dropped?

Added: ____ (4-5)

____

____

Dropped: ____ (6-7)

____

____

2. Have the number of humanities courses or units required for graduation changed?

They have: decreased by two or more courses ______ (8)

decreased by one course ______

remained the same ______

increased by one course ______

increased by two or more courses ______

3. Have special efforts been made to attract any of the following groups of students to humanities courses? (Check all that apply)

	Recruitment Efforts	Especially Designed Courses	No Special Effort	
Occupational students	______	______	______	(9)
Academically underprepared students	______	______	______	(10)
Returning, older students	______	______	______	(11)
Special groups (e.g. women, minorities, senior citizens)	______	______	______	(12)
Non-degree students	______	______	______	(13)

4. Has the frequency of media use in humanities courses changed?

	Increased	Decreased	Stayed the Same	
In-class video cassettes or tapes	______	______	______	(14)
Open-circuit TV courses	______	______	______	(15)
Audio-tutorials	______	______	______	(16)
Films/Film strips	______	______	______	(17)
Audio cassettes, videotapes, records	______	______	______	(18)
Computer-assisted instruction	______	______	______	(19)

5. Has your college sponsored any conferences, workshops, or special events dealing with some aspect of the humanities?

Yes ______

No ______ (20)

If yes, please specify: ____

____

____

II. NEARLY ALL COLLEGES SET ASIDE FUNDS TO SUPPORT SPECIAL PROGRAMS, COURSE AND MATERIAL DEVELOPMENT, GUEST SPEAKERS, INSTRUCTIONAL MEDIA, AND FACULTY FELLOWSHIPS. APPROXIMATELY WHAT PERCENTAGE OF THESE DISCRETIONARY INTRAMURAL SUPPORT FUNDS WERE GIVEN TO THE HUMANITIES STAFF AND PROGRAMS AT YOUR COLLEGE LAST YEAR?

________% (21-22)

III. APPROXIMATELY WHAT PERCENTAGE OF THE FUNDS RECEIVED BY YOUR COLLEGE FROM EXTRAMURAL GRANTS OVER THE PAST FIVE YEARS HAS BEEN EARMARKED FOR THE HUMANITIES?

________% (23-24)

IV. INTERDISCIPLINARY COURSES ARE A WAY OF PRESENTING STUDENTS WITH A VARIETY OF MATERIAL AND CONCEPTS IN AN INTEGRATED FASHION. THEY ARE SOMETIMES CONDUCTED BY ONE INSTRUCTOR WHO COVERS A NUMBER OF SUBJECTS; SOMETIMES BY TWO OR MORE INSTRUCTORS, EACH RESPONSIBLE FOR SPECIFIC AREAS. BUT BY DEFINITION, INTERDISCIPLINARY COURSES CUT ACROSS SEVERAL AREAS, SUCH AS SCIENCE AND HUMANITIES.

1. What interdisciplinary courses are being taught this term and which disciplines are involved?

Course	Disciplines Involved	
(Example: Humanities I)	(Literature, History)	
____________	____________	(25-26)
____________	____________	
____________	____________	
____________	____________	
____________	____________	
____________	____________	

2. In most cases does one instructor assume total course responsibility or are instructors from various disciplines involved?

	One Instructor Involved	Various Instructors Involved	
In planning the course?	_____	_____	(27)
In teaching the course?	_____	_____	(28)

3. When instructors from more than one department are involved, which department receives credit for the course?

Both or all departments _____ (29)

The department organizing the course _____

Other arrangement (please explain) ____________

____

4. How is instructor load credit apportioned?

Each instructor receives full hourly credit ______ (30)

Each instructor receives partial hourly credit ______

Other arrangements (please explain) ____________________________

____

____

V. 1. ADVISORY BOARDS OR COMMITTEES COMPRISED OF LAY CITIZENS OR PRACTITIONERS ARE INVOLVED WITH MOST OCCUPATIONAL PROGRAMS. RECENTLY SOME COMMUNITY COLLEGES HAVE DEVELOPED SUCH GROUPS FOR THEIR HUMANITIES PROGRAM. DOES YOUR COLLEGE HAVE A LAY ADVISORY COMMITTEE TO THE HUMANITIES?

No ______

Yes ______ (31)

2. IF YES, WHAT YEAR WAS IT FORMED?

19________ (32-33)

VI. HOW CAN AN INSTRUCTOR RECEIVE SUPPORT FOR DEVELOPING NEW COURSES OR NEW INSTRUCTIONAL MEDIA? (Check all that apply).

	Total Number of Awards Last Year	Number Awarded to Humanities Instructors Last Year	
Sabbatical leaves	________	________	(34-37)
Faculty fellowships	________	________	(38-41)
Instructional development grants	________	________	(42-45)
Funds from outside agency(ies)	________	________	(46-49)
Other (please specify)	________	________	(50-53)

Thank you for completing this form. Please return it to the

Center for the Study of Community Colleges
1047 Gayley Avenue, Suite 205
Los Angeles, CA 90024

CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF COMMUNITY COLLEGES
A NON PROFIT CORPORATION

ARTHUR M. COHEN
JOHN LOMBARDI
FLORENCE B. BRAWER

1047 GAYLEY AVENUE, SUITE 205
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90024
(213) 208-6088

October 25, 1982

Dear Colleague:

Your college is participating in a nationwide study conducted by the Center for the Study of Community Colleges under a grant from the National Endowment for the Humanities. The study is concerned with curriculum, instruction, institutional support, and community involvement in the humanities.

We are asking you for information about the humanities in your college's community service area. All responses to this survey are confidential. Our concern is with aggregate data.

For purposes of this project, the humanities are defined as the study of cultural anthropology and geography, foreign languages, history, literature, philosophy, political science, religious studies, and the appreciation and history of the arts, music, and theatre.

Please complete and return this form within two weeks.

Thanks for your assistance.

Cordially,

Florence B Brawer

Arthur M. Cohen
Principal Investigator

Florence B. Brawer
Research Director

AMC/FBB:jbl

Enclosure

Fall 1982

COMMUNITY SERVICES SURVEY

College: ____________________ (1-3)

I. PLEASE INDICATE THE NUMBER OF HUMANITIES-RELATED ACTIVITIES THAT WERE OFFERED EITHER ON OR OFF YOUR CAMPUS DURING THE PAST ACADEMIC YEAR. HOW WERE THEY FUNDED?

		Percentage of Total Cost of Event Funded by:*			
	Number of Activities	Participants	College Funds	External Grants	
Art exhibits	______	______%	______%	______%	(4-14)
Concerts, Recitals, Musical Events	______	______%	______%	______%	(15-25)
Lectures, Seminars	______	______%	______%	______%	(26-36)
Theatrical productions	______	______%	______%	______%	(37-47)
Film series	______	______%	______%	______%	(48-58)
Community-based forums on humanities-related issues	______	______%	______%	______%	(59-69)
Historical or period celebration (e.g., Renaissance Fair, County Centennial)	______	______%	______%	______%	(70-77; 4-6)
Tour of local cultural facilities (e.g., architectural or historical sites)	______	______%	______%	______%	(7-17)
Activities highlighting a particular ethnic group (i.e., Black Culture Week, Asian Culture Week)	______	______%	______%	______%	(18-28)
Other (please specify) ______________					(29-30)

*Participants = Fees paid by the people attending the event
College Funds = Regularly budgeted and scheduled funds
External Grants = Special project funds

II. WHAT PERCENT OF ALL COMMUNITY SERVICE ACTIVITIES DID THESE HUMANITIES-RELATED EVENTS CONSTITUTE?

__________% (31-32)

III. WHAT PERCENT OF THE REGULAR HUMANITIES FACULTY ARE TYPICALLY INVOLVED IN PLANNING OR PRESENTING THESE ACTIVITIES?

__________% (33-34)

IV. IN THE PAST ACADEMIC YEAR, WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING OFF-CAMPUS AGENCIES OR ORGANIZATIONS WERE INVOLVED IN PLANNING OR PRESENTING THESE ACTIVITIES? (Check all that apply.)

City, Campus, or County Library	______	(35)
Senior Citizen Centers or Homes	______	(36)
Local Art Council, Art Society, Museum or Gallery	______	(37)
Drama or Theatrical Group	______	(38)
Musical Group (Symphony, Choral Society)	______	(39)
Community Interest Groups (e.g., historical society, literary, travel)	______	(40)
Parks and Recreation Department	______	(41)
Other Community Colleges	______	(42)
Local High Schools	______	(43)
Local University	______	(44)
YWCA/YMCA, Church, Synagogue	______	(45)
Civic Organization (e.g., Kiwanis, Chamber of Commerce)	______	(46)
Local Radio or T.V. Station	______	(47)
Local Bookstores, Record Stores	______	(48)
Other Commercial Groups (e.g., banks, shopping centers)	______	(49)
Auditorium or Large Capacity Facilities	______	(50)
Political Organizations	______	(51)
Other (please specify)______________________		(52)

V. OVER THE PAST FIVE YEARS, HAS THE NUMBER OF HUMANITIES-RELATED ACTIVITIES IN THE COMMUNITY SERVICE AREA

1. Increased by ________% (53-54)

OR

2. Decreased by ________% (55-56)

OR

3. Stayed the same _____ (57-58)

VI. WHAT IS THE PROCESS OF APPROVAL FOR COMMUNITY SERVICE NON-CREDIT COURSES?

1. All academic-related courses must be approved by faculty in an academic department _______ (59)

2. Community services staff has authority over its offerings _______

3. Each offering must be approved by a college-wide committee _______

4. Dean of academic affairs (instruction) must approve _______

5. Other: ____

____

Thank you for completing this form. Please return it to:

The Center for the Study of Community Colleges
1047 Gayley Avenue, Suite 205
Los Angeles, California 90024

CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF COMMUNITY COLLEGES
A NON PROFIT CORPORATION

ARTHUR M. COHEN
JOHN LOMBARDI
FLORENCE B. BRAWER

1047 GAYLEY AVENUE, SUITE 205
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90024
(213) 208-6088

Dear Colleague:

Thank you for returning the survey forms from your humanities instructors. We appreciate your efforts in this important national study. However, we have not received the forms from the following instructor(s):

INSTRUCTOR	COURSE

In the event that any of these instructors have misplaced their surveys, let us know and we will send new forms. If the class section listed was cancelled, or the instructor is no longer at your college, please return those survey forms with a notation as to why they are not completed.

Because of the careful sampling involved, the success of our study depends on a very high response rate. If we can be of assistance, or if you need a procedural clarification, feel free to call us collect.

Thanks again for your assistance.

Cordially,

Arthur M. Cohen
Principal Investigator

AMC/jbl

CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF COMMUNITY COLLEGES
A NON PROFIT CORPORATION

ARTHUR M. COHEN
JOHN LOMBARDI
FLORENCE B. BRAWER

1047 GAYLEY AVENUE, SUITE 205
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90024
(213) 208-8088

December 3, 1982

Dear Colleague:

Several weeks ago we sent you two surveys asking about humanities programs and requirements at your college. Did you receive them? If so, please return the Facilitator Survey and the Community Services Survey to us as soon as possible so that we can begin to compile the data and prepare reports for the colleges participating in this project. If you did not get them please let us know so that we can send copies to you.

We know you are asked to respond to many surveys and that this is a busy time of year for you. But our National Endowment for the Humanities-sponsored project depends on an exceedingly high rate of response and we need your participation. We do appreciate your efforts on behalf of this important national study.

Cordially,

Arthur M. Cohen
President

Florence B. Brawer
Florence B. Brawer
Research Director

CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF COMMUNITY COLLEGES
A NON PROFIT CORPORATION

ARTHUR M. COHEN
JOHN LOMBARDI
FLORENCE B. BRAWER

1047 GAYLEY AVENUE, SUITE 205
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90024
(213) 208-6083

Dear Colleague:

Thank you for the prompt return of the surveys we sent asking about humanities programs and requirements at your college. We are compiling the data and will have a report out to you soon.

The next phase of our National Endowment for the Humanities-sponsored project involves a survey directed to a sample of instructors teaching humanities courses in March, 1983. In order to select the sample, we need a copy of your college catalog and the class schedule covering courses that will be taught next March. Can you forward these materials at this time?

We look forward to hearing from you.

Cordially,

Florence B Brawer

Arthur M. Cohen
Principal Investigator

Florence B. Brawer
Research Director

AMC/FBB:jbl

CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF COMMUNITY COLLEGES
A NON PROFIT CORPORATION

ARTHUR M. COHEN
JOHN LOMBARDI
FLORENCE B. BRAWER

1047 GAYLEY AVENUE, SUITE 205
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90024
(213) 208-6088

December 28, 1982

Dear Colleague:

We are looking forward to receiving the Facilitator Survey and the Community Services Survey from your college. Try to get them in by January 10, 1983. Because of the careful sampling procedures involved, it is critical that we receive the completed surveys from each college in our sample.

If you could please take time to complete the surveys and mail them in time to reach us by January 10, we would be most grateful.

Cordially,

Florence B. Brawer

Arthur M. Cohen
Principal Investigator

Florence B. Brawer
Research Director

CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF COMMUNITY COLLEGES
A NON PROFIT CORPORATION

ARTHUR M. COHEN
JOHN LOMBARDI
FLORENCE B. BRAWER

1047 GAYLEY AVENUE, SUITE 205
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90024
(213) 208-6088

December 28, 1982

Dear Colleague:

We tried reaching you by phone but were unsuccessful. To date, we have not received the Facilitator Survey or the Community Services Survey from your college.

Try to get the surveys to us by January 10, 1983. Because of the careful sampling procedures involved, it is critical that we receive the completed surveys from each college in our sample.

If you could please take time to complete the surveys and mail them in time to reach us by January 10th, we would be most appreciative.

Cordially,

Florence B. Brawer

Arthur M. Cohen
Principal Investigator

Florence B. Brawer
Research Director

CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF COMMUNITY COLLEGES
A NON PROFIT CORPORATION

ARTHUR M. COHEN
JOHN LOMBARDI
FLORENCE B. BRAWER

1047 GAYLEY AVENUE, SUITE 205
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90024
(213) 208-6088

January 19, 1983

Dear Colleague:

We are just about finished collecting the Facilitator Survey and the Community Services Survey from the colleges participating in our project. As soon as we receive the remainder of the surveys we will compile the data and send a report to you.

The next phase of our National Endowment for the Humanities-sponsored project involves a survey directed to a sample of instructors teaching humanities courses in March, 1983. In order to select the sample, we need a copy of your college catalog and the class schedule covering courses that will be taught next March.

We look forward to hearing from you.

Cordially,

Florence B. Brawer

Arthur M. Cohen
Principal Investigator

Florence B. Brawer
Research Director

AMC/FBB:sv

CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF COMMUNITY COLLEGES
A NON PROFIT CORPORATION

ARTHUR M. COHEN
JOHN LOMBARDI
FLORENCE B. BRAWER

1047 GAYLEY AVENUE, SUITE 205
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90024
(213) 206-6088

Dear Colleague:

Responses to the Fall, 1982, Humanities Survey have been tabulated. A report of the findings will be sent to you shortly. Thank you for your assistance.

The next phase of our National Endowment for the Humanities-sponsored project involves a survey directed to a sample of instructors teaching humanities courses in Spring, 1983. In order to select the sample, we need a copy of your college catalog and the class schedule covering courses that will be taught in March. Can you get these materials to us right away?

Once again, thank you for your excellent cooperation.

Cordially,

Arthur M. Cohen
Principal Investigator

Florence B. Brawer
Florence B. Brawer
Research Director

CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF COMMUNITY COLLEGES
A NON PROFIT CORPORATION

ARTHUR M. COHEN
JOHN LOMBARDI
FLORENCE B. BRAWER

1047 GAYLEY AVENUE, SUITE 205
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90024
(213) 208-6088

March 11, 1983

Here are the results of the surveys of humanities education that we conducted recently with your help. Your president has received a two-page summary of this report.

The next phase of this National Endowment for the Humanities-sponsored project involves a survey of the faculty. We have drawn a sample of instructor names from your current class schedule and will be asking you to direct a short survey form to them. We will be forwarding the individually addressed forms to you for distribution later this month.

Thanks very much for your assistance in this important study. We will send all reports to you as they become available. Meantime please call on us for any additional information we may provide about the humanities in two-year colleges nationwide.

Cordially,

Florence Brawer

Arthur M. Cohen Principal Investigator	Florence B. Brawer Research Director	Jack Friedlander Staff Associate

AMC:jbl

Enclosure

CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF COMMUNITY COLLEGES
A NON PROFIT CORPORATION

ARTHUR M. COHEN
JOHN LOMBARDI
FLORENCE B. BRAWER

1047 GAYLEY AVENUE, SUITE 205
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90024
(213) 208-6088

March 11, 1983

Here is a summary of the surveys of humanities education that we conducted recently. of your college facilitated the gathering of data for this study and has received a longer report. Our thanks to you both.

The next phase of this National Endowment for the Humanities-sponsored project involves a survey of the faculty. We have drawn a sample of instructor names from your current class schedule and will be directing a short survey form to them via the facilitator.

We do appreciate your college's participation in this study. Please call on us if we may provide additional information.

Cordially,

A Cohen
Arthur M. Cohen
Principal Investigator

Florence Brawer
Florence B. Brawer
Research Director

Jack Friedlander
Jack Friedlander
Staff Associate

AMC:jbl

Enclosure

CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF COMMUNITY COLLEGES
A NON PROFIT CORPORATION

ARTHUR M. COHEN
JOHN LOMBARDI
FLORENCE B. BRAWER

1047 GAYLEY AVENUE, SUITE 205
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90024
(213) 208-6088

Dear Colleague,

Our national study of curriculum and instruction in the humanities is well on its way, and we appreciate your participation in this project.

On   we sent   survey forms to you for distribution to a sample of your faculty. Have you received them? If not, please call us collect at (213) 208-6088 immediately. If you have received them, we hope that you can get them all back to us within the next ten days.

Please take care in packaging the forms for return to the Center and send them by first class mail.

Thanks very much for your help.

Cordially,

Arthur M. Cohen
Principal Investigator

AMC/jbl

APPENDIX D

Reports

Paper Presented to the
Associaton for
the Study of Higher
Education/AERA-J,
San Francisco,
October 21, 1983

COMPARING HUMANITIES INSTRUCTORS

Florence B. Brawer

In 1975, 1977, and 1978, we at the Center for the Study of Community Colleges conducted nationwide surveys of instructors teaching the humanities and the sciences. These questionnaires netted a considerable amount of data upon which we formulated several recommendations to increase the then deteriorating plight of the liberal arts in community colleges. To our gratification, many colleges acted upon these ideas, adapting them to their own use and developing programs to implement them. And since then, again to our gratification, we find that both the humanities and the sciences have gained some strength in community colleges nationwide.

But recommendations and their concomitant activities are one thing. Data are another, the foundation upon which considered suggestions are formulated. Recently, the National Endowment for the Humanities asked us to update some of our earlier studies and to compare important findings from previous years with responses to a new survey. Accordingly, in Spring 1983 we administered a survey to a new sample of instructors in community colleges nationwide. Selecting items that had previously proved useful and adding some new items that would provide pertinent information, we surveyed humanities instructors who were teaching 1467 class sections in 159 colleges. These figures compare with the 860 instructors in 178 colleges surveyed in 1977 and selected on the basis of their teaching every Nth section of classes, and with the 1975 sample, which consisted of 1493 humanities instructors in 156 colleges who were chosen by selecting every Nth person listed on faculty rosters.

In spring 1983 we also administered this same survey to 403 liberal arts instructors in colleges that are a part of our six district liberal arts and transfer education projects: City Colleges of Chicago, Dallas County Community College District, Los Angeles Community College District, Maricopa County Community College District, Miami-Dade Community College, and St. Louis Community College. These two cohorts provide us with current information about the way humanities and liberal arts instructors address their teaching, as well as with information that may be compared with responses of the previous two surveys. They also provide us with answers to specific questions. For example, how does the recent sample of humanities instructors compare with previous samples in terms of age, ethnicity, degrees held, and experience? Have the full-time/part-time ratios changed? What types of impact do outside agencies make in terms of providing grants? These are among the questions I will address today.

First, some demographic and experiential information about our respondents. Although the ways in which the three populations were sampled and the differences in survey items account for some discrepancies in response rates, we find consistent answers to many of the questions. For example, full time/part time ratios appear to be remarkably steady. In 1975, 76% of our respondents reported they were full time; 24%, part time. In 1977 the ratio of full-timers to part-timers was 76:18%, and in 1983, 78:21%.

In terms of age, a shift has occurred over the 1975-1983 time range, as indicated in Table 1.

Table 1
Faculty Age in 10 Year Intervals

Age	1975 (N=1493)	1983 (N=1467)
25 and Under	1	1
26-30	12	3
31-35	20	11
36-40	16	21
41-45	13	19
46-50	14	14
51-55	10	13
56-60	8	8
61 and Older	6	11

We see that in 1975, 49% of the faculty were 40 years and younger while in 1983, this age range fell to 36%. Conversely, faculty over 40 years represented 51% of the sample in 1975 and eight years later, 65%.

The number of years taught at their present institution also reflects this aging (Table 2).

Table 2
Years Taught at Present Institution

	1975 (N=1493)	1983 (N=1467)
Less than one year	10%	7%
1-2 Years	14%	6%
3-4 Years	17%	8%
5-10 Years	42%	25%
11-20 Years	15%	48%
Over 20 Years	2%	6%

Whereas 48% of the 1975 faculty had taught 11 or more years, 60% of the 1983 faculty so indicated.

In other words, the faculty are getting older. If faculty members had retired and been replaced by new faculty on a one-to-one basis, the age differential would be zero. Our data suggest that despite some incentives for early retirement, most faculty are remaining in their institutions and new faculty are not being hired. This aging factor has implications in terms of salaries as well as in the way the faculty address their work.

Gender is more consistent. In the two periods for which we collected these data (1975 and 1983), males represented 67% and females 33% of the humanities faculty. When it comes to ethnic groups, however, affirmative action does seem to have had an effect. Table 3 shows a slight rise in faculty whose background is American Indian/Alaskan, Black/Afro-American, and Other-than-Chicano/Hispanic and, concomitantly, a slight decline in White/Caucasian faculty members.

Table 3
Racial/Ethnic Background

	1975 (N=1493)	1983 (N=1479)
American Indian/Alaskan	0.2%	1%
Black/Afro-American	3%	4%
Chicano	2%	2%
Other Hispanic	0.3%	3%
Asian/Pacific Islander/ Filipino	1%	1%
White/Caucasian	91%	87%
Other	2%	2%

In previous reports we predicted a rise in the number of instructors who hold the doctorate. This proved to be the case, with 16% reporting the doctorate in 1975, 19% in 1977, and 23% in 1983. On the other hand, in 1975, 24% of our respondents said they were working on the doctorate whereas our recent survey indicates only 16%. The faculty already in the colleges acquire doctorates and, since there are so few new hires, the ratio of non-doctorate holders goes down. These figures help support our thesis of an older, more entrenched faculty teaching the humanities in community colleges.

How does this older, more highly degreed faculty address their work? In a sense, they seem to be more professionally oriented. They tend more to be members of professional organizations, to have attended regional meetings, and to have presented a paper. Other activities also show tendencies of instructors to be more involved in their profession (Table 4).

Table 4
Professional Activities of Humanities Instructors

	1975 (N=1493)	1983 (N=1467)	Percent Increase
Have you ever			
Received a formal award for outstanding teaching	21%	23%	2%
Taught courses with faculty members outside your department	27%	35%	8%
Had and article published	29%	34%	5%
Attended a conference or symposium related to teaching	76%	78%	2%
Co-authored a book	13%	19%	6%
Applied to an outside agency for a grant	25%	25%	0%
Received grant from own college	4%	10%	6%
Received stipend from private foundation	7%	12%	5%
Received grant from federal/state agency	6%	25%	19%

The 19% increase in grants from federal and state agencies is interesting. Since the 1983 survey asked about sources of outside income, we are able to see how much assistance the National Endowment for the Humanities has provided for faculty members in community colleges. If these figures had been tracked over each subsequent year, we anticipate that we would have seen a gradual increase in support from this agency.

Our instructor respondents also seem to be somewhat more satisfied with their professional lives than they were in 1975 -- or else, more resigned. Table 5 indicates an increase in seeing as very attractive "Doing what I am doing now" (41% in 1975 and 53% in 1983).

Table 5
Five Years From Now
How Attractive Would You Find

	Very Attractive		Somewhat Attractive		Un-Attractive	
	'75	'83	'75	'83	'75	'83
A faculty position at a four-year college or university	42	35	38	38	20	27
A faculty position at another community or junior college	22	17	44	38	34	44
An administrative position in a community or junior college	15	11	26	25	59	64
A position at a school outside the U.S.	24	18	41	38	35	44
A position in a professional association	6	6	27	29	68	65
Any position but at this college	6	4	21	20	75	77
A non-teaching, non-academic position	3	12	27	33	64	55
I would be doing what I am doing now	41	53	43	35	16	12
I have no idea	8	10	14	12	78	76

At the same time, they also see a non-teaching, non-academic position as very attractive now (3% in 1975 and 12% in 1983). Satisfaction, compliance, and/or a sense of reality, which allows the faculty to know that they are employed at a time when teaching positions are difficult to find are indicated by the facts that they remain in teaching and they appear satisfied with their present institution. Also, they eschew faculty positions at four-year colleges or universities and at other community colleges; administrative positions in community colleges; academic positions outside the United States; and "any position but this college".

Compared to earlier responses, these same faculty members generally have slightly less assistance available to them in terms of clerical and paraprofessional help, test scoring facilities, and media production -- perhaps another reflection of the fiscal problems in many community colleges. When such help is available to them, they tend to make slightly less use of it (Table 6). Only in the case of media production facilities/assistance do somewhat more instructors now make use of this help (1975 - 41%; 1983 - 49%).

Table 6
Assistance Available/Used

	Assistance is available to me		Will Utilize this term	
	1977 (N=860)	1983 (N=1467)	1977	1983
Clerical help	80	71	59	57
Test-scoring facilities	45	43	17	17
Tutors	40	33	21	17
Readers	13	7	5	3
Paraprofessional aides/ instructional assistants	13	7	6	6
Media production facilities/ assistance	68	67	41	49
Library/bibliographical assistance	82	73	54	51

When it comes to activities or assistance that instructors see as improving their course, today's respondents do not differ much from the 1977 sample when they were first asked about such help (Table 7).

Table 7
What Would It Take To Make The Course Better?

	1977 (N=860)	1983 (N=1467)
More freedom to choose materials	10%	9%
More interaction with colleagues or administrators	21%	20%
Less interference from colleague or administrators	5%	4%
Larger class (more students)	13%	14%
Smaller class	27%	25%
More reader/paraprofessional aides	12%	13%
More clerical assistance	19%	17%
More media or instructional materials	43%	39%
Stricter prerequisites for admission to class	22%	22%
Fewer or no prerequisites for admission to class	1%	1%
Instructor release time to develop course and/or materials	38%	38%
Special assistance for underprepared students	N/A	45%
Professional development opportunities for instructors	36%	39%

Despite their limited use of media, "More media or instructional materials are still seen as most desirable (1977 - 43%; 1983 - 39%), followed by " Instructor release time to develop course and/or materials (38% for both 1977 and 1983); "Professional development opportunities for instructors" (1977 - 36%; 1983 - 39%); and "Smaller class" (1977 - 27%; 1983 - 25%).

What emphasis do instructors give to various classroom activities? Our respondents were asked about a designated activities strength in determining a student's grade.

Table 8
Emphasis Given To Class Related Activities

	Not included in determining student's grade		Included but counts less than 25% toward grade		Counts 25% or more toward grade	
	1977 (N=860)	1983 (N=1467)	1977	1983	1977	1983
Papers written outside class	35	31	37	36	28	33
Papers written in class	69	67	18	21	12	12
Quick score/objective tests	33	34	26	22	41	44
Essay exams	35	31	19	20	47	49
Field reports	84	81	13	15	3	4
Oral recitations	60	58	31	30	10	12
Workbook completion	89	84	9	12	2	4
Regular class attendance	46	36	44	53	10	11
Participation in class discussion	31	33	55	55	14	12
Individual discussions with instructor	83	85	15	13	2	2
Other	91	82	4	10	6	8

Looking at the activities which count 25% or more in determining the grade, the most recent respondents showed increases over the 1977 sample in terms of papers written outside class (28% - 33%), quick/score objective tests (41% - 44%), essay exams (47% - 49%), field reports (3% - 4%), oral recitations (10% - 12%), workbook completion (2% -4%), regular class attendance (10% - 11%). Although most of these increases are slight and caution must be used in interpreting such small increments, taken together it would seem that instructors are becoming more demanding, stricter in their requirements for students in the classes about which they were reporting. This again may reflect the "older faculty" syndrome discussed earlier, or it may point to greater moves away from the laissez-faire model of the sixties. Whatever its reasons, however, expectations seem to be greater for student performance. If we consider education as a whole and look at higher education today we might also consider that the 1960's calls for "relevance" and "I'll take whatever I want; you can't tell me", are about to turn around. Perhaps this will be more useful for coming generations of community college students.

I thank you.

CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF COMMUNITY COLLEGES
A NON PROFIT CORPORATION

ARTHUR M. COHEN
JOHN LOMBARDI
FLORENCE B. BRAWER

1047 GAYLEY AVENUE, SUITE 205
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90024
(213) 208-6088

TRENDS IN COMMUNITY COLLEGE HUMANITIES EDUCATION 1977-1982

Results of Fall 1982 Survey

In fall 1982 the Center for the Study of Community Colleges conducted a survey of humanities education in the nation's community and junior colleges. An objective of this survey was to identify changes that had occurred in humanities programs during the past five years. The study was sponsored by the National Endowment for the Humanities.

Information in this study was obtained from a Facilitator Survey and a Community Services Survey that were sent to a random national sample of 172 community and junior colleges. The Facilitator Survey was completed in 151 colleges and the Community Services Survey was completed in 139 colleges. The findings from these surveys are reported in the following four sections of this report.

1. Humanities Courses Added to the Curriculum from 1977-1982.
2. Interdisciplinary Courses Offered in Fall 1982.
3. Support for Humanities Faculty and Programs.
4. Humanities in Community Services Divisions.

Humanities Courses Added to the Curriculum From 1977-1982

In the past five years the number of humanities courses required for graduation was increased in 16 percent of the colleges and decreased in only 3 percent of the colleges. The number of humanities courses required for graduation did not change in the remaining 81 percent of the institutions studied.

Seven in ten colleges added one or more new humanities courses to their programs. The number of colleges adding a new humanities course exceeded the number that dropped a humanities course from their program by a rate of more than two to one. In general, the types of humanities courses added to the curriculum focused on a specific topic (e.g., women in politics, medieval ethics, history of labor in the U.S., literature of the Irish, music in American life). New humanities courses added at five or more colleges in the past five years are listed below.

Humanities Courses Added by Five or More Colleges from 1977-1982 (151 Colleges)

Subject	Percent of Colleges That Added a Course
Liberal Arts/Humanities	27%
Introduction to the humanities	
Interdisciplinary humanities	
Film history	
Communications studies	
Literature	25%
Contemporary literature	
Bible	
Women's literature	
Science fiction	
Special groups (e.g., literature of the American Indian, literature of the old west, writers of the Pacific Northwest, juvenile fiction)	
Philosophy and Religion	23%
Ethics	
Medical-business ethics	
Logic	
Religious studies	
History	19%
History of special populations in America (e.g., Women, Blacks, Hispanics, Indians, Jews),	
State and local history, History of business and labor in the U.S.	
Special topics (e.g., history of architecture, dance, sex attitudes, future society)	
Western civilization	
Foreign Languages	13%
German	
Spanish	
French	
Music History/Appreciation	11%
American Music (e.g., jazz, history of popular music in the U.S., Afro-American music, music in American life)	
Art History/Appreciation	11%
Art History	
Art Appreciation (e.g., art in life, art in America)	
Political Science	9%
Current affairs/world problems	
Special topics (e.g., women in politics, politics in sports, American legal thought, human rights, uses of power)	
Cultural Anthropology	5%
Special topics in cultural anthropology (e.g., myth, magic, folk religion; medical anthropology; African culture; anthropology and the analysis of communications)	

Recruitment efforts. Occupational students, returning older students, and special groups of students (e.g., women, minorities, senior citizens) were actively recruited to humanities courses in over one-half of the community colleges. The percentage of colleges in which humanities faculty made a special effort to attract various groups of non-traditional students into their courses are reported below.

Percent of Colleges in Which Non-Traditional Students Were Recruited to Humanities Courses (151 Colleges)

	Recruitment Efforts	Designed Special Courses	No Special Effort
Returning, older students	46%	23%	46%
Special groups (e.g., women, minorities, senior citizens)	39%	32%	48%
Non-degree students	37%	19%	58%
Occupational students	32%	34%	49%
Academically underprepared students	26%	33%	51%

Interdisciplinary Studies

In fall, 1982, interdisciplinary courses were offered in 51 percent of the community colleges. Over 60 percent of the interdisciplinary courses included a literature component. History was included in nearly half of the interdisciplinary offerings. Art history/appreciation, music history/appreciation, and philosophy were incorporated in over 30 percent of the multi-discipline courses.

The average number of subject areas covered in the interdisciplinary courses was as follows:

Two disciplines - 32% of the courses
Three disciplines - 26% of the courses
Four disciplines - 28% of the courses
Five or six disciplines - 14% of the courses

Nearly six in ten of the interdisciplinary courses were team taught. However faculty members from various disciplines were involved in the planning of 67 percent of these courses.

Which department received credit for an interdisciplinary course when instructors from more than one department were involved? The responses to this question were as follows: both or all departments - 46%; the department organizing the course - 44%; and other (usually some combination of the above) - 10%. Full-hourly credit was awarded to each faculty member involved in team teaching a interdisciplinary course at 51 percent of the colleges while partial hourly credit was granted to each instructor at 36 percent of the institutions. Some other arrangement for awarding hourly credit to faculty members team teaching an interdisciplinary course was employed in 13 percent of the colleges.

Titles of some of the interdisciplinary offerings and the subjects addressed in these courses are listed below.

Course Title	Disciplines Involved
American Military History	Economics, history, literature, philosophy, political science
Medical Ethics	Philosophy and nursing
Contemporary Humanities	Literature, music, art, philosophy, drama
Contemporary Understandings	Literature, sociology, economics, administration of justice

Course Title	Disciplines Involved
Business History	History and business
Biological Revolution	Philosophy, psychology, biology
Religion and the Arts	Religion, philosophy, art, music, drama
Greek Achievement	Poetry, drama, art, philosophy
Art Literature and History: Study of the Old Testament	Literature and history
Energy and Society	History, sociology, science
The Indian and American History	History and anthropology
Civilizations of Asia and Africa	History and anthropology
Human Sexuality	Sociology and anthropology
British History	Literature and history
Medieval History	Literature and history
Arts and Civilization	Arts, history, composition
Puerto Rican Society and Culture	History, sociology, English composition
Black Biographical Sketches	History, art, English composition
Business in literature	Business and literature
History of Mathematics	History and math
The Human Condition Through Literature	Nursing, English literature, history, anthropology
Ways of Knowing	Literature, art, psychology, science
The Art of Being Human	Literature, philosophy, fine arts
The Life Cycle Through Literature	Literature and psychology
Personality in Literature	Literature and psychology
Environment Amid Changing Values	Literature, history, philosophy, natural sciences
Art, Music, and Ideas	Art, music, literature, history
Awakening of Individuality	Literature, philosophy, music, psychology
Understanding Cultures	Religion, economics, business, sociology
Religious Themes in Literature	Literature, religion, philosophy

Support for Humanities Faculty and Programs

In the academic year 1982-1983, seven in ten colleges set aside discretionary intramural funds for their humanities staff and programs. About 20 percent of all discretionary intramural funds distributed by colleges were directed to humanities programs to support such activities as instructional development activities, sabbatical leaves, guest speakers, and faculty fellowships.

In the past five years 56 percent of the community colleges received funds from external sources that were earmarked for the humanities. On average, humanities programs received 16 percent of all external grants awarded to the colleges in the sample.

Support for developing instructional materials. The table below shows (1) the percentage of colleges in which humanities faculty received support from each of five sources to develop new courses or instructional materials in 1981-82; and (2) the average number of humanities faculty members who received a particular form of support.

Sources of Support for Developing New Courses or New Instructional Media 1981-82
(151 Colleges)

	Percent of Colleges	Average Number Awarded to Humanities Faculty
Sabbatical leaves	29%	2.2
Instructional development grants	26%	3.3
Funds from outside agencies	19%	1.7
Faculty fellowships	10%	2.4
Other	8%	2.7

Advisory boards. Lay advisory committees (including arts councils) to the humanities have been formed in 17 percent of the community colleges. One-half of these committees were formed since 1980.

Use of media. Nearly all of the colleges reported that in the past five years the frequency of media use in humanities courses had either increased or remained the same. The percentage of colleges in which the frequency of media use in humanities courses had increased are reported below.

Percentage of Colleges in Which the Frequency of Media Use in Humanities Courses Increased from 1977-1982 (151 Colleges)

Audio cassettes, videotapes, records	68%
In-class video cassettes or tapes	60%
Films/film strips	57%
Computer-assisted instruction	38%
Audio-tutorials	33%
Open-circuit TV courses	26%

Community Services Offerings in the Humanities

Between 1977 and 1982 the number of arts and humanities activities offered by community service divisions increased at 53 percent of the colleges, decreased at 13 percent of the colleges, and remained the same at the remaining 34 percent of the institutions studied. The average rate of increase in the number of arts and humanities activities offered was 19%; the average decrease in the types of offering was five percent.

In the academic year 1981-82, off-campus agencies were involved in planning or presenting arts and humanities activities in nearly all community colleges. Members of musical groups, art councils, libraries, community interest organizations, and local high schools were involved in planning or presenting humanities-related activities in over 40 percent of the colleges. Representatives from local radio or television stations, civic organizations (e.g., Kiwanis, Chamber of Commerce), and senior citizen centers or homes participated in the planning or presentation of off-campus humanities activities in nearly one-third of the colleges.

One in three of the regular humanities faculty were involved in planning or presenting arts or humanities events offered through community service divisions. In 20 percent of the colleges, the faculty in an academic department were charged with approving all academic-related non-credit courses.

Process of approving non-credit courses. In 58 percent of the colleges, community services divisions have authority for approving the non-credit courses they offer. The dean of academic affairs (instruction) must approve non-credit offerings in 37 percent of the colleges; a college-wide committee must approve all community services non-credit courses in 13 percent of the institutions.

Method of funding humanities-related activities. The type and number of humanities-related activities that were offered either on or off campus during the 1981-82 academic year are presented below along with information on how these activities were funded. On average, humanities-related activities offered through community service divisions were supported by a combination of college funds - 63%, participant fees - 24%, and external grants - 13%.

Humanities-Related Activities Offered Either On-Or-Off-Campus In 1981-82
(139 Colleges)

			Percentage of Total Cost of Event Funded by:*		
	Percentage of Colleges Offering Activity	Average Number of Activities	Participants	College Funds	External Grants
Concerts, recitals musical events	90.3	11.3	17.8%	70.3%	10.0%
Art exhibits	84.5	5.1	15.4%	70.8%	8.4%
Lectures, seminars	81.5	7.1	15.7%	63.7%	16.3%
Theatrical productions	77.2	3.4	31.1%	63.3%	5.0%
Film series	65.0	3.7	18.2%	65.2%	15.5%
Activities highlighting a particular ethnic group (i.e., Black Culture Week, Asian Culture Week)	58.4	1.3	14.4%	75.5%	8.6%
Tour of local cultural facilities (e.g., architectural or historical sites)	55.6	3.3	41.8%	55.0%	3.2%
Community-based forums on humanities-related issues	45.8	1.4	22.0%	42.5%	27.4%
Historical or period celebration (e.g., Renaissance Fair, County Centennial)	40.8	.6	25.8	57.8%	11.6%
Other (please specify)	26.5	.4			

*Participants = Fees paid by the people attending the event
College Funds = Regularly budgeted and scheduled funds
External Grants = Special project funds

CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF COMMUNITY COLLEGES
A NON PROFIT CORPORATION

ARTHUR M. COHEN
JOHN LOMBARDI
FLORENCE B. BRAWER

1047 GAYLEY AVENUE, SUITE 205
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90024
(213) 208-6088

C-12

Address given to American Assn.
of Community and Junior Colleges'
Annual meeting, St.Louis Missouri
April 5, 1982

Promoting a Liberal Education

Florence B. Brawer

Various data sources, published documents, and recently, the popular press suggest that we are still experiencing repercussions of the sixties and seventies. Student cries for relevance in their course materials, for the right to select the number and types of classes they take without considering previous requirements, and for reduction in the work they do outside class have all had their effects. Many colleges and universities have responded by inflating grades and eliminating entrance and exit testing. And many educators— administrators and faculty alike— have adopted laissez-faire attitudes which contribute to the prevailing notion that just as access to post-secondary education was easy, so are the demands placed on students.

The most lenient, the most accessible, and the most strongly affected institutions are the community colleges. Here swelling numbers of people, many labeled "non-traditional" because they deviated so greatly from the type of student enrolled in colleges in the fifties and earlier, were swayed by a do-anything-you-like attitude. If they did not want to enroll in a prescribed number or sequence of courses, or if they did not have sufficient prerequisites for those few courses that still demanded certain proficiencies, they could always participate in the college's much touted community education offerings. These students, so nonchalant in their approach to higher education, came from all strata of society—affluent and poor, traditional and non-conformist, white and minority, intelligent and barely literate. What they all held in common was, for sundry reasons, an interest in higher education.

with a concomitant disinterest in learning, a desire to "get there"--wherever there might be-- without putting forth the effort.

In this climate, the liberal arts declined precipitously. And with this decline, successful transfer to a four year college or university has become almost impossible. Indeed, the community colleges do not serve as stepping stones to higher learning for most students. Instead, these postsecondary institutions provide them with occupational studies, remedial education, and a variety of ad hoc cultural and recreational activities. More than half the students entering community colleges do so for purposes of occupational training. Remedial studies are prominent; one-third of all mathematics offered in community colleges is at the less-than college algebra level and three of eight English class enrollments are in remedial courses.

As the data and reports indicate, the so-called transfer programs are especially weak. Ostensibly comprised of courses similar to those that students would take if they were enrolled in the lower division of senior institutions, the transfer programs have become a catch-all for students who already have degrees--or who have no aspirations toward one--and for those who have failed to gain entrance to one of the community college's selective-admissions allied health or technology curriculums. In fact, outside the occupational programs, there is little linearity or sequence in curriculum. Few sophomore level courses are offered; few courses demand prerequisites.

The curriculum has taken a lateral form with students dropping in and out almost at will. And the colleges have stepped completely outside the tradition of higher education, a tradition that was based on academic disciplines, the liberal arts, scholarship, and the process of learning. Instead, these post-secondary institutions have become agencies preparing people for the work force, offering short-cycle courses of interest to limited numbers of the citizenry, and attempting to remedy the defects occasioned by the failures of the lower schools.

Since the community colleges serve as the main point of entry to post-secondary education for most students who continue their studies beyond the high school, the form of education they provide is important to all who are concerned with higher education in America. More than half the students who begin college begin in a community college; forty percent of all first time in college, full-time freshmen; two thirds of the ethnic minorities. The community colleges have indeed opened education beyond the high school for sizeable numbers of people who would never have attended college, thus popularizing higher education and affording access. But access to what? If the 4.5 million students attending the 1250 two-year colleges in America find a curriculum comprised nearly exclusively of career, compensatory, and community-based studies, those who seek access to the higher learning have been ill-served. And the tradition of liberal learning in American higher education has been debased.

Those who would maintain the liberal arts in the community colleges have attended primarily to preserving the disciplines and patterns of thought by a continued adherence to freshmen and sophomore type courses in college parallel programs. They have sought to have these courses required for students who would obtain associates degrees. But it is a constant battle. Most students come to community colleges seeking job skills or recreation; most are part-timers; fewer than five percent obtain degrees. More students transfer to universities from occupational programs than from so-called transfer programs.

Few students graduate. Most community college students eschew the associate in arts degree; most avoid liberal arts courses per se; many who attempt liberal arts courses fail to complete them.

If the liberal arts have a contribution to make to the lives of all students, they must be reconceptualized to fit the realities of community colleges. It is time to restructure them so that they have a place beyond that which they occupy in the college parallel programs, to extract their finest principles so that they can be included in the career, compensatory, and community education programs that dominate the curriculum, and to expand them lest they fade out as surely as the transfer programs are fading.

In the course of our work with the National Endowment for the Humanities and the National Science Foundation and in our current projects funded by the Mellon and Ford Foundations, we are organizing several activities to enhance the liberal arts and to facilitate student transfer to universities and to occupations of choice. These activities are concerned with integrating the liberal arts in community services and continuing education, developing liberal arts segments in occupational programs, designing interdisciplinary courses, encouraging the use of student support services, articulating with secondary schools as well as with four-year colleges and universities, promoting honors programs for selected studies, providing advisory committees to the liberal arts, and developing a liberal arts career option. Most of the 38 colleges in our six districts--Chicago, Dallas, Los Angeles, Maricopa (Phoenix), Miami-Dade, and St. Louis, are engaged in some of these activities now. However, most activities could be strengthened, modified, and extended. The remainder of this paper will discuss briefly these eight activities.

LIBERAL ARTS IN COMMUNITY SERVICES AND CONTINUING EDUCATION

Portions of the liberal arts are thriving in certain community service and continuing education programs. Community forums in the humanities and courses by newspaper have been developed, and arts and crafts, concerts, exhibits, museum shows are in place in most districts. But the link between these activities and the academic program is missing.

The community service and continuing education divisions have typically maintained liberal arts-related activities for adults. The courses have been populated by people taking them for personal interest, not for degree credit. And with rare exception, they have been taught by instructors other than the regular faculty.

A useful linkage between the non-credit presentations in the liberal arts and the regular academic program could be effected. The continuing education directors might be encouraged to give first priority to the regular faculty in selecting staff. Faculty could be stimulated to prepare courses and presentations to be offered through the community service divisions. Necessary budget links should be forged by the administrators.

LIBERAL ARTS IN OCCUPATIONAL AREAS

Because career program coordinators insist that certification requirements preclude students from taking courses outside the occupational program itself, it is extremely difficult to maintain liberal arts course requirements for students enrolled in career programs. Offering a host of optional courses for purposes of displaying degree requirements does little to point up the value of such courses and their relevance to the student's career objective.

Accordingly, rather than attempting to coerce students in occupational programs to take courses in the liberal arts, portions of certain liberal arts courses--hence concepts--can be placed in the occupational courses themselves. These course modules could be as little as an hour or two of lecture by a liberal arts instructor on key concepts stemming from one of the academic disciplines. The purpose of the short segment would be to point up to the students some of the implications of their career practice. Successful interventions of this type have been made by philosophy instructors teaching medical and business ethics, history instructors discussing backgrounds of rules governing occupations, art instructors pointing up design implications in certain manufacturing tasks, anthropology instructors discussing cross-cultural patterns of dealing with social and personal issues, geography instructors discussing what students in a travel agent program need to know.

Such modular interventions could be made if the concerned liberal arts instructors were given course load credit for applying the requisite number of hours to the guest appearances in the occupational programs.

Some documents regarding this activity are available through ERIC. The AACJC has sponsored several regional workshops devoted to these activities under grants from the National Endowment for the Humanities.

INTERDISCIPLINARY COURSES

According to Center data, the integrated or interdisciplinary courses in the sciences, social sciences, humanities, and communications were among the few areas to show an increase in enrollments in the 1970s at a time when courses in the specialized study of history, literature, music, art, and other liberal arts areas showed a severe decline. This resurgence resulted from cancellation of the specialized classes and the merging of course components into required general education interdisciplinary units.

The most successful interdisciplinary courses have been in the humanities and the social sciences. Some take an historical perspective; others are based on a problem-solving or conceptual approach. The interdisciplinary science courses are often concerned with the environment.

Building and sustaining required interdisciplinary courses calls for much administrative leadership. The faculty who work together on such courses cannot merely provide short units in their own disciplines. Although considerable time is necessary to develop interdisciplinary courses, one important concomitant is the collegial relationships that develop among participating faculty members. And students are provided with both an overview and an integration of the liberal arts that might not otherwise be available to them.

Information on interdisciplinary courses is available in several Center/ERIC monographs: Science Education in Two-Year Colleges: Environmental Sciences, Science Education in Two-Year Colleges: Interdisciplinary Social Sciences, and The Humanities in Two-Year Colleges: Trends in Curriculum.

STUDENT SUPPORT SERVICES

Every college has a wide array of academic support services; learning laboratories, tutorial services, counseling activities. The association between these services and the liberal arts courses, however, is not always as clear as it might be. These links could be strengthened in a number of ways so that they serve more students.

Historically, the science courses have had laboratory components whereby the students spend an hour or two in a laboratory for every hour in the lecture section. This concept could be extended to other areas of the liberal arts with the laboratory being, in fact, the learning laboratory. Point-of-entry tests to the regular academic courses could be administered. Then, for students falling below a certain cut point on reading or writing skills, an hour or two per week in the learning laboratory could be required as part of the regular course. Exit testing could also be administered to students intending to transfer to universities, thus guaranteing certain course expertise.

This pattern would work best if the nature of the experience in the learning laboratory were merged witn the content of the course itself. Thus the liberal arts instructors would have to work out pattern sequences with the laboratory manager, just as the physics or chemistry instructors key the laboratory experiences to the lecture sections. Similar associations could be made between the faculty and the tutorial services and with the other activities currently maintained on behalf of the less well-prepared students. Compensatory education through support services would be a natural for those individuals who require special assistance.

ARTICULATION WITH SECONDARY SCHOOLS

The liberal arts program can be strengthened by better relationships with the secondary schools. Matching liberal arts courses with the lower division in nearby universities may be useful, but only a relatively few students transfer to universities, whereas nearly all of them matriculate from neighboring high schools.

Counselors have typically been the ones to maintain high school relationships. Now, articulation with the secondary schools can take several other forms. For example, the liberal arts faculty could work more closely with their secondary school counterparts to keep the college courses from becoming either repetitious of secondary school classes or removed in concept from anything for which the students have been prepared. Visits by community college instructors to secondary school liberal arts classes and by secondary school instructors to community college classes could be increased.

Students can be recruited to liberal arts courses in the community colleges if instructors and counselors make particular efforts to do so through the secondary schools. Advance placement of high school seniors has been undertaken in numerous institutions. But the instructors themselves should take the initiative in going into the high schools to publicize their own courses.

And finally, the community college instructors in the liberal arts could help define expectations for students coming to the college. For too many years the colleges have sent the message that it matters little how well or poorly the students perform in the secondary school; the college will enroll them anyway. The secondary schools can be bolstered by new information about the competencies expected of college students, as Miami-Dade is doing. And feedback to secondary school instructors could be provided with information about former students who enroll in the community college liberal arts classes and the success that they are having.

HONORS PROGRAM

Establishing an honors program is another activity that hearkens back to an earlier era when colleges were more structured and success was better defined. Some college districts are already involved in such programs, while others may be interested in formulating them.

The Honors Program could involve two groups of students. In both instances, however, these programs would be closely tied to student services. College recruiters—faculty and counselors—could interview the most promising high school students and offer special inducements to them to spend their freshmen and sophomore years at the community college. Tuition and fee waivers for selected students is one type of inducement; special honor courses is another.

In addition to the immediate high school graduates, the colleges could establish special courses and offerings for currently enrolled students who have achieved a stipulated grade point average. Guest lectures, special plays or other events could be offered to these students as encouragement and recognition.

ADVISORY COMMITTEES TO THE LIBERAL ARTS

Advisory committees to occupational programs are common in most community colleges, and advisory committees to the humanities have become popular in some colleges in the past five years. Such boards directed to the liberal arts, however, are rare--if indeed they exist at all.

To maintain their currency, community college programs make connections with the communities they serve. These connections could be aided by an advisory committee whose purpose is to help the college maintain vital liberal arts programs. The committee can provide information, advice, and visibility for the programs; review information on trends in liberal arts education on the local, state, and national levels and so aid in keeping the programs current; offer policy reactions and comments on the programs from the points of view of persons outside the colleges; and aid in planning special events.

Advisory committee members can integrate educational efforts with community offerings and opportunities. Some may employ students who are completing a community college program or suggest areas of employment. Others may be able to show that the humanities, sciences, and arts can become an integral part of life, whether one pursues them as an occupation or as a non-vocational interest.

These committees can also assist faculty in formulating goals, objectives, and activities; help students and graduates of liberal arts programs find jobs; assist faculty members in relating instruction to community needs; develop public information programs; assess the adequacy of facilities, equipment, and teaching materials; assist in developing community surveys related to the liberal arts; develop cooperative education training plans and agreements; and recommend criteria to use in evaluating programs. Considerable information is available from both ERIC and the Center regarding advisory programs.

LIBERAL ARTS CAREER OPTION

The best structural elements of occupational programs and the most useful components in liberal arts courses could be merged into a liberal arts-career program. The program would be managed by a program head and a group of between five and ten faculty members. The curriculum would be comprised of pre-existing liberal arts courses selected for their general appeal. Students would be selected from the great cohort of recent high school graduates who are either unsure of the types of careers they wish to enter or are inadmissible to the selective occupational programs, but who know they are going to college because they want to be employable.

The program would center on the liberal arts along with cooperative work experience. Students would take traditional courses in the liberal arts plus a course in business. They would serve as apprentices in agencies and shops for which specialized training was not a requisite for job entry: department stores, small shops, insurance and brokerage agencies, and all types of business offices.

The purpose of this program would be to prepare students for work entry by assisting them to understand their environment, making them aware of the links that hold their society together, showing them how to get along with their fellow workers, teaching them to communicate in speech and in writing, preparing them to work with an agencies' clients. Placing the liberal arts at the core of such a program would be restorative to that curriculum area while at the same time it would afford students a sense of purpose in their studies. Faculty members working together with a lay advisory committee to the program would select the courses to be placed in it. The courses would all be required; there should be few options within the program. The staff would also arrange for work billets for students in the program, devise admissions criteria, and publicize the program in the institution's feeder secondary schools.

As I noted earlier, many of these activities are already in place in almost all colleges. What we are urging is involvement, dialogue, and outreach so that more students are encouraged to enroll in the liberal arts, more students are helped in their transition from high school to college and from college to the university, and more students are given the proper background to succeed in their future work. All these activities should be amplified. Results will be worth the extra effort.

A LONGITUDINAL ANALYSIS OF COMMUNITY COLLEGE HUMANITIES FACULTY, 1975 - 1983

By Florence B. Brawer

Much attention has been paid to the beleaguered status of community college humanities curricula in the wake of growing vocationalism. But what about the humanities faculty? Have their characteristics as a group changed in the last decade? Are today's instructors teaching the humanities differently than instructors in the mid-1970's?

In an attempt to answer these and other questions this paper examines data collected by the Center for the Study of Community Colleges in three nationwide surveys: a 1975 survey of 1,493 randomly selected humanities instructors in 156 colleges; a 1977 survey of 860 instructors at 178 colleges; and a 1983 survey of 1,467 instructors at 159 colleges. Although differences in sampling and survey items account for discrepancies in the data, the three surveys provide an insight into the changes -- and lack of changes -- among humanities faculty during the past eight years.

Demographic and Professional Characteristics

Demographic information, data related to the professional activities of the instructors, and instructor opinions concerning job satisfaction were collected in the 1975 and 1983 surveys. These data indicate that there has been little faculty turnover and that there is more satisfaction with (or possibly complaisance toward) the work environment.

While the percentage of males and females remained constant for both 1975 and 1983 (67% male, 33% female), the characteristics of humanities faculty have changed in terms of age and ethnicity. As indicated in Table 1, the faculty as a group is older now than it was eight years ago. In 1975, 49% of the faculty were 40 years old or younger; in 1983, however, the proportion of faculty in this age range fell to 36%. Conversely, faculty over 40 years of age represented 51% of the sample in 1975 and 65% in 1983. During the same time period, less dramatic changes occurred in the ethnic breakdown of the faculty. The percentage of white/Caucasian instructors dropped from 91% to 87% while there were slight increases in the number of faculty with American Indian, Afro-American, and non-Chicano Hispanic backgrounds. (See Table 2.)

[TABLE ONE HERE]

The demographic data, then, reveal two facts. First, despite some incentives for early retirement, faculty members are remaining in their jobs and new instructors are not often hired. If faculty members had been replaced by new personnel on a one-to-one basis, the age difference between the 1975 and 1983 groups would be zero. In fact, the percentage of faculty who had taught for 11 or more years at the same college rose from 17% in 1975 to 54% in 1983. Second, despite the low number of new-hires, affirmative action has had at least some effect in increasing the number of ethnic minorities in humanities faculty. In most demographic respects, however, the faculty has remained the same; as a group, the instructors are simply getting older.

[TABLE TWO HERE]

Attitudes and Approaches Toward the Job

How does this older, more experienced faculty address its work? Table 3 indicates that the faculty is more professionally oriented than it was in 1975. Respondents to the 1983 survey were more likely, for example, to have published an article, attended a conference on teaching, or taught courses with faculty members in other disciplines. It is also interesting to note that although the percentage of instructors applying to an outside agency for a grant did not change between 1975 and 1983, faculty members in the 1983 sample were considerably more successful in receiving grant money. These data reflect the aging of the faculty; instructors are more involved in the profession and show increased savvy in grantsmanship. Another sign of this increased professionalism is the growth of the percentage of instructors who hold the doctorate degree (16% in 1975 and 23% in 1983).

[TABLE THREE HERE]

The instructor respondents also seem to be more satisfied with their professional lives in 1983 than they were in 1975. Data on Table 4 show an increase in the percentage of instructors who categorized "Doing what I am doing now" as "very attractive" (41% in 1975 and 53% in 1983). Satisfaction (or simple resignation) to the realities of the job market are also indicated by the facts that instructors have remained in the teaching profession and that they appear satisfied with their present institutions. The 1983 instructors were less likely to rate positions at four-year colleges, teaching positions at other community colleges, administrative positions at other community colleges, and academic positions outside of the united states as "very attractive." There was, however, an increase in the percentage of instructors who indicated that a "non-teaching, non-academic" position was a "very attractive" career alternative (3% in 1975 and 12% in 1983). Nonetheless, humanities faculty in 1983 are, in comparison with the 1975 respondents, more willing to stay where they are.

[TABLE FOUR HERE]

Instructional Assistance and Practices

Data on instructional assistance to faculty and information on faculty instructional practices were collected in the 1978 and 1983 surveys. Overall, the findings reveal that in the six years between 1977 and 1983, instructors have become more demanding of students.

[TABLE FIVE HERE]

Table 5 details findings concerning instructional assistance available to faculty. Perhaps because of growing fiscal problems, faculty in 1983 have less assistance available to them in terms of clerical or professional help, test-scoring facilities, and media production. In addition, when such help is available, instructors tend to make slightly less use of it. Only in the case of media production do slightly more of the 1983 instructors (49%) make use of this service than do instructors in the 1977 sample (41%).

[TABLE SIX HERE]

When it comes to opinions concerning needed improvements in instruction (detailed in Table 6) the 1983 sample does not differ significantly from the 1977 sample. Pluralities in both groups cited "More media or instructional materials" as an area needing improvement. This was followed by "Instructor Release Time to Develop Course and/or Materials," "Professional Development Opportunities," and "Smaller Classes."

Finally, the tata from Table 7 show the relative emphasis given by instructors to various classroom activities. These data indicate that instructors in 1983 were more likely to use out-of-class term papers, quick-score objective tests, essay exams, field reports, oral recitations, and workbook completion in determining 25% or more of the student's grade. Thus, it seems that faculty are becoming more demanding of students in the community college humanities classroom.

Conclusion

This longitudinal look at community college humanities faculty reveals an obvious, but often overlooked fact: The faculty as a group is getting older. Concomitantly, instructors have taken on more established roles in professional organizations, have become more settled in career positions, and are more demanding of students. The long range impact of this aging faculty, however, should not be overlooked. As Table 1 indicates, 19 percent of today's humanities instructors at two-year colleges are 56 years of age or older; thus close to one-fifth of the faculty will probably retire in the next ten years. While the last ten years have seen little faculty turnover, administrators planning for the decade ahead need to consider institutional responses to vacancies caused by the growing number of retiring instructors.

Cohen, A.M. The Humanities in Two-Year Colleges: A Survey of the Faculty. Los Angeles: Center for the Study of Community Colleges, 1975. 30pp. (ED 115 314)

Cohen, A.M. Instructional Practices in the Humanities, Fall 1977. Los Angeles: Center for the Study of Community Colleges, 1978. 18pp. (ED 160 145)

Florence B. Brawer is Research Director at the Center for the Study of Community Colleges and a Staff Writer at the ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges.

TABLE 1

Faculty Age in 10 Year Intervals

Age	1975 (N=1493)	1983 (N=1467)
25 and Under	1	1
26-30	12	3
31-35	20	11
36-40	16	21
41-45	13	19
46-50	14	14
51-55	10	13
56-60	8	8
61 and Older	6	11

TABLE 2

Racial/Ethnic Background

	1975 (N=1493)	1983 (N=1479)
American Indian/Alaskan	0.2%	1%
Black/Afro-American	3%	4%
Chicano	2%	2%
Other Hispanic	0.3%	3%
Asian/Pacific Islander/ Filipino	1%	1%
White/Caucasian	91%	87%
Other	2%	2%

TABLE 3

Professional Activities of Humanities Instructors

	1975 (N=1493)	1983 (N=1467)	Percent Increase
Have you ever			
Received a formal award for outstanding teaching	21%	23%	2%
Taught courses with faculty members outside your dept.	27%	35%	8%
Had an article published	29%	34%	5%
Attended a conference or symposium related to teaching	76%	78%	2%
Co-authored a book	13%	19%	6%
Applied to an outside agency for a grant	25%	25%	0%
Received grant from own college	4%	10%	6%
Received stipend from private foundation	7%	12%	5%
Received grant from federal/state agency	6%	25%	19%

TABLE 4

Five Years From Now How Attractive would You Find

	Very Attractive		Somewhat Attractive		Un-Attractive	
	'75	'83	'75	'83	'75	'83
A faculty position at a four-year college or university	42	35	38	38	20	27
A faculty position at another community or junior college	22	17	44	38	34	44
An Administrative position in a community or junior college	15	11	26	25	59	64
A position at a school outside the U.S.	24	18	41	38	35	44
A position in a professional association	6	6	27	29	68	65
Any position but at this college	6	4	21	20	75	77
A non-teaching, non-academic position	3	12	27	33	64	55
I would be doing what I am doing now	41	53	43	35	16	12
I have no idea	8	10	14	12	78	76

TABLE 5

Assistance Available/Used

	Assistance is available to me		Will Utilize this term	
	1977 (N=860)	1983 (N=1467)	1977	1983
Clerical help	80	71	59	57
Test-scoring facilities	45	43	17	17
Tutors	40	33	21	17
Readers	13	7	5	3
Paraprofessional aides/ instructional assistants	13	7	6	6
Media production facilities/ assistance	68	67	41	49
Library/bibliographical assistance	82	73	54	51

5% COTTON FIBER

TABLE 6

What Would It Take to Make The Course Better?

	1977 (N=860)	1983 (N=1467)
More freedom to choose materials	10%	9%
More interaction with colleagues or administrators	21%	20%
Less interference from colleague or administrators	5%	4%
Larger class (more students)	13%	14%
Smaller class	27%	25%
More reader/paraprofessional aides	12%	13%
More clerical assistance	19%	17%
more media or instructional materials	43%	39%
Stricter prerequisites for admission to class	22%	22%
Fewer or no prerequisites for admission to class	1%	1%
Instructor release time to develop course and/or materials	38%	38%
Special assistance for underprepared students	N/A	45%
Professional development opportunities for instructors	36%	39%

TABLE 7

Emphasis Given To Class Related Activities

	Not included in determining student's grade		Included but counts less than 25% toward grade		Counts 25% or more toward grade	
	1977 (N=860)	1983 (N=1467)	1977	1983	1977	1983
Papers written outside class	35	31	37	36	28	33
Papers written in class	69	67	18	21	12	12
Quick score/objective tests	33	34	26	22	41	44
Essay exams	35	31	19	20	47	49
Field reports	84	81	13	15	3	4
Oral recitations	60	58	31	30	10	12
Workbook completion	89	84	9	12	2	4
Regular class attendance	46	36	44	53	10	11
Participation in class discussion	31	33	55	55	14	12
Individual discussions with instructor	83	85	15	13	2	2
Other	91	82	4	10	6	8

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, LOS ANGELES UCLA

BERKELEY · DAVIS · IRVINE · LOS ANGELES · RIVERSIDE · SAN DIEGO · SAN FRANCISCO SANTA BARBARA · SANTA CRUZ

ERIC® CLEARINGHOUSE FOR JUNIOR COLLEGES
8118 MATH-SCIENCES BUILDING
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90024
(213) 825-3931

December 7, 1983

Dr. Dale F. Campbell
Community College Review
310 Poe Hall
North Carolina State University
Raleigh, NC 27650

Dear Dr. Campbell:

Enclosed is our next review column for your consideration. The article, by Florence B. Brawer, takes a longitudinal look at community college humanities faculty.

Please let me know if you have any questions or suggestions for further articles.

Sincerely,

Jim Palmer
User Services Librarian

ERIC® CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGES
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

AUG 1 7 1984

8118 Math-Sciences Building
Los Angeles, California 90024